DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 111 EA 011 373

AUTHOR Cole, Barbara, Ed.
TITLE School Planning Evaluation Communication System. Consultant's Manual.
INSTITUTION Oregon Univ., Eugene. Center for Educational Policy and Management.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 76
NOTE 135p.; For related documents, see EA 011 372-379; Not available in paper copy due to marginal legibility of original document
AVAILABLE FROM CEPM Publications, Center for Educational Policy and Management, College of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403 ($2.50)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Consultants; Consultation Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Glossaries; *Manuals; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; *Program Planning; School Districts; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *School Planning Evaluation Communication System

ABSTRACT

This manual is intended to assist facilitators helping educational organizations plan and implement the School Planning, Evaluation, and Communication System (SPECS). The first section describes each component of SPECS and includes information about documents and data necessary for implementing the system. Section Two provides actual activities to be used in beginning implementation of SPECS. This section includes one district's master plan and suggestions for developing such a plan. The third section includes an outline for an orientation workshop, a checklist for the consultant, and a sample workshop evaluation form. A matrix chart listing SPECS materials and their use and intended users is also included. This third section also contains SPECS materials as modified by school personnel and a set of SPECS terminology designed to ensure that the consultant and organization personnel are using the same terminology. Section Four contains tips about what to do and what not to do that were gleaned by the development team during the field test. The final section presents ideas from consultants and field-test site personnel present at the final SPECS field-test conference. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED168111

SCHOOL PLANNING EVALUATION COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

CONSULTANT'S MANUAL

Edited

by

Barbara Cole

EA 011 373

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CEPM

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

September 1976

Center for Educational Policy and Management
University of Oregon

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE i

INTRODUCTION 1

I WANT TO BE A SPECS CONSULTANT -- WHAT DO I NEED TO KNOW? 3

What is SPECS?. 3

Component One: A Systems Analysis of the Organization . . . 9

Component Two: Program Budgeting & Cost Accounting. 11

Component Three: Program Planning, Evaluation and Communication 14

Component Four: Community Based Broad Goal Definition . . . 19

Component Five: Assessing Achievement of the Organization's Broad Goals. 21

A SCHOOL DISTRICT WANTS SPECS -- WHAT DO I DO NOW? 24

Planning for Implementation 24

Developing the Master Plan. 28

An Example of a Master Plan 30

TAKING THE NEXT STEPS -- WHICH WAY DO I GO?. 35

Outline for SPECS Orientation Workshop. 37

Workshop Checklist for the SPECS Consultant 39

Sample of SPECS Workshop Evaluation Form. 40

SPECS Materials Use and User Chart. 41

SPECS Terminology 45

Examples of SPECS Materials as Modified by Site Personnel 48

WHAT DO I NEED TO KNOW BESIDES SPECS?. 106

OTHER SPECS CONSULTANTS HAVE SAID. 110

CONCLUSION 116

BIBLIOGRAPHY 117

PREFACE

The Center for Educational Policy and Management (CEPM) is the overarching organization of which the Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration (CASEA), a research and development unit is a part. Located at the University of Oregon, the Center is part of a network of educational research and development centers and regional laboratories scattered across the country. Originally funded by the Office of Education, and more recently funded primarily by the National Institute of Education, the Center's main focus has been change with school districts.

The School Planning, Evaluation and Communication System (SPECS) began in 1969 with Terry C. Eidell and John M. Nagle attempting to conceptualize data-based program planning and evaluation for public schools. Their ideas were pilot-tested for three years in the South Lane School District in Cottage Grove, Oregon. Following the pilot test, Center staff who comprised the Development Team revised the materials in preparation for field testing. During the past two years, SPECS has been field tested in more than a dozen school districts and one community college, located in seven states throughout the country.

The purpose of this Consultant's Manual is to assist persons in providing consultative services in implementing SPECS. The manual is written for superintendents, curriculum leaders, professors, teachers or others who might be assisting with the implementation of SPECS. In addition to the information provided in this manual, it is necessary that professionals serving in a

consultant capacity also become familiar with SPECS materials and the implementation booklets for the five components of SPECS.

Grateful acknowledgement is given to the many SPECS consultants who have contributed their thoughts to the contents of this manual. They include consultants Fred Bertolaet, Leroy Casagranda, Ralph Forsythe, Alan Gaynor, John Kohl, and former Development Team members John M. Nagle and Harold E. Walker.

Special thanks go to consultant Gerald Rasmussen, who assisted in the development of the final outline for the manual. CEPM Associate Dean and Director and former Development Team member Lloyd DuVall, who was responsible for the direction of SPECS during the program's final year and for providing major consultation to SPECS sites, deserves heartfelt thanks for his continued suggestions, support and encouragement.

Barbara Cole
September 1976

INTRODUCTION

Implementing a system such as SPECS is a task which must be taken cautiously and seriously. Sufficient planning must precede any implementation efforts, thus this manual is intended to assist individuals who will be engaged in helping educational organizations plan and implement SPECS.

Five sections are included in the manual. The first "I Want To Be a SPECS Consultant -- Who Do I Need to Know?" draws from Jack M. Nagle's overview of SPECS entitled SPECS: What It Is and What It Does. This section describes each of the components and includes information about documents and data necessary for implementing the system.

Section Two provides the beginning of concrete activities designed to implement SPECS. The section includes one district's Master Plan and suggestions for developing such a plan.

The third section includes an outline for an orientation workshop, a checklist for the consultant and a sample workshop evaluation form. In addition, it includes a matrix chart listing the SPECS materials, including their intended use and users.

Throughout the field-test, school personnel throughout the country used SPECS materials or modified them thus tailoring them to their needs. Several of those modified materials are included thus allowing the consultant to view alternatives to the "official" SPECS materials.

Perhaps most importantly, a set of SPECS terminology is included. Obviously if the consultant and organization personnel are not using the same terminology, unneeded communication problems may appear. Although the consultant may wish to alter the definitions, they are available here as a beginning point.

Included in Section Four is a potpourri of "what to do" and "what not to do" as gleaned by the Development Team during the field test.

The final section is taken from what other consultants and some field-test site personnel stressed at the final SPECS Field-Test Conference. Remember, these were experiences that consultants had within their particular settings. You, the reader and potential SPECS consultant may have a different set. Those who contributed to them hope you will find them to be helpful as you assist individuals and organizations who are planning and implementing SPECS.

I WANT TO BE A SPECS CONSULTANT --

WHAT DO I NEED TO KNOW*

What is SPECS?

The development of SPECS -- School Planning, Evaluation, and Communication System -- began in June, 1969, when Terry L. Eidell and Jack M. Nagle attempted to conceptualize a data-based program planning and evaluation system for public schools and to develop an initial set of related procedures and materials. During the three years, they took advantage of every possible opportunity to test their ideas and materials on practicing school personnel. They entered a three-year agreement in September, 1970, with South Lane School District in Cottage Grove, Oregon, to engage in a cooperative, pilot effort to implement and simultaneously modify the five components of the system. As a pilot project, the South Lane experience achieved most of its objectives. To varying degrees of completeness and satisfaction, all five components of SPECS were implemented in the district and generated useful information for district personnel.

Perhaps most important, however, the project lasted long enough to allow both its positive and negative effects to be felt. After three years, it resulted in a number of accomplishments and benefits that confirmed the value of systematic, data-based program planning and evaluation in schools; at the same time, it also revealed a number of important weaknesses in SPECS itself,

---

*The material for this section has been derived, almost entirely, from Nagle, John M., SPECS: What It Is and What It Does, University of Oregon 1975.

in its procedures and materials, and in the particular strategy employed to implement it in South Lane.

Since mid-1973 and termination of the formal relationship between the South Lane School District and the Center for Educational Policy and Management (CEPM), SPECS underwent a thorough review and revision in an effort to profit from lessons learned during the prior four years of developmental work. Only its two basic concepts -- the SPECS approach to program planning and evaluation, and the SPECS systems design for districtwide program assessment and development -- remain essentially intact. Entirely new procedures have been developed for introducing SPECS to personnel in a school district, for carefully planning its implementation, and for gradually phasing its five components into a district. And the original SPECS materials used in South Lane have been thoroughly revised and greatly expanded in light of gaps and difficulties discovered during the pilot project.

These revised materials include a set of orientation materials for introducing SPECS to teachers, administrators, and school board members; a series of implementation booklets relevant to the system's five components; and an array of illustrative and actual documents for successfully implementing each component.

In addition, since mid-1973, many of the revised and expanded SPECS concepts, procedures, and materials either have been or are now being carefully field-tested in nearly a dozen school organizations in the United States. In addition to teachers and

administrators in each district, the continuous testing and refinement has involved one or more coordinators of SPECS in each site, a cadre of specially trained SPECS consultants, and several staff members from CEPM. Some members of the CEPM staff have been primarily interested in SPECS as a program planning and evaluation system; others have been more interested in carefully documenting its implementation processes, costs, and effects in each site.

Crucial to SPECS is a particular view of what it means to plan, implement, evaluate, and replan any program of activities in a school. This view remains the same whether the program is directly related to the instruction of students -- such as the teaching of American history and fourth grade language arts -- or only indirectly related -- such as the provision of pupil transportation services and the maintenance of school district buildings. Similarly, the view remains essentially the same regardless of the duration of the program -- one day, one week, one semester, or one entire school year -- and regardless of the number of individuals involved in the program -- one student or a group of students, one teacher, a team of teachers, or an entire school faculty. In effect, the SPECS approach to program planning and evaluation is applicable to all instructional and noninstructional programs and activities carried out in schools.

SPECS is defined in terms of three kinds or categories of information about a program of activities: its outcomes, its processes, and its inputs. To the extent possible, the outcomes

of a program are always identified in SPECS in terms of "specific changes in behavior or performance". Usually, this means changes in the performance of the program's clients.

The outcomes of a program -- whether it is instructional or noninstructional in nature -- can be of two kinds: desired and actual. A program's goals and objectives describe the program's desired outcomes, for they specify either the terminal characteristics or the specific changes in those characteristics that the program is designed to encourage or effect. On the other hand, measures of performance or of the changes realized during the program identify its actual outcomes. Throughout SPECS, this distinction between intentions and results -- between desired and actual states of a program -- is considered crucial to the process of program planning and evaluation.

It is imperative to distinguish between what is intended and what is actually done. Curriculum guides and daily or weekly lesson plans usually describe only the desired processes or procedures of a program; by contrast, videotapes, teacher-kept logs, and reports based on explicit observation schedules describe some of the actual processes carried out during the program. Similarly, whereas a printed bus schedule and roster of drivers describe some of the intended processes of a pupil transportation program, daily logs prepared by those drivers, mileage records, and comments solicited from parents and students regarding the current quality of transportation services register important information about the program's actual processes.

In SPECS, inputs are defined strictly in terms of dollar resources -- the dollars required to purchase whatever time, personnel, space, equipment, and materials are necessary to carry out a particular set of processes within an instructional or noninstructional program. A program budget identifies in dollars the required or desired inputs of the program; by contrast, a program cost accounting report identifies the program's actual input in terms of dollar expenditures.

Program planning is the process of making explicit, prior to implementation, the specific combination of outcomes, processes, and inputs that those responsible for the program would like to see realized. For example, a program plan for an instructional program identifies the program's desired outcomes (or instructional objectives), its desired processes (or planned instructional, evaluative, and classroom management procedures), and its desired inputs (or required resources).

Program evaluation takes its cues from a specific program plan and involves those who are responsible for the program in (1) monitoring its implementation, (2) collecting data on its actual outcomes, processes, and inputs, and (3) then identifying and analyzing discrepancies between the program's original desired state and its actual state. Depending upon the frequency and timing of data collection, it is possible to conduct three quite different kinds of program evaluation.

First, if data about the program's actual outcomes, processes, and inputs are collected regularly as those processes are gradually being implemented, these data can be used immediately to modify the program's objectives, its remaining budget, or some combination of the three. For example, a brief quiz administered early in an instructional program may well indicate that students lack even the most basic skills required for the program, and that the program's remaining objectives and procedures are completely unrealistic and should be modified to meet students' current ability levels. This kind of "in process" evaluation is sometimes identified as formative evaluation.

Second, when the program has been completed, the full array of data regarding both its desired outcomes, processes, and inputs and its actual outcomes, processes, and inputs can be used to answer the culmination questions, "Did the program do what it was designed to do? And if not, why not?" This kind of post facto evaluation in which discrepancies between desired and actual states are identified and analyzed at the conclusion of a program is sometimes referred to as summative evaluation.

And third, the evaluative data collected during one cycle of a program can be used immediately to develop a revised plan for the program's next cycle of operation. Objectives can be modified on the basis of data, new processes can be designed on the basis of experience, and evidence of past accomplishments can be used to

justify entirely new budgetary allocations. This is truly what it means to behave cybernetically -- that is, to be self-corrective and use explicit information about the past as a basis for developing plans for the future. This kind of cybernetic, adaptive behavior is, of course, the ultimate goal of any systems approach to program planning and evaluation.

Component One: A Systems Analysis of the Organization

Component One of SPECS calls for a descriptive systems analysis of the organization. It requires collection and display of information about the district's current array of instructional and non-instructional functions, activities, or programs -- what they are, where and when they occur, who is responsible for each, and, most important, how they are interrelated. To generate this information about the district's current "program structure," district personnel begin by identifying a few broad categories of activities, and then they disaggregate each of these broad categories into levels of increasingly specific activities.

In addition, Component One requires district personnel to answer the following question: "For which particular clusters of operating programs do we want to collect desired and actual outcome, process, and input data, and then use these data for systematic program planning, evaluation, replanning, and articulation?" Ideally, all data about a program's outcomes, processes,

and inputs probably ought to be collected and used at the same level of detail. Realistically, however, complete comparability of data is not always possible or practical.

Given this trade-off, it is probably most practical to identify a level of operating programs for collecting and using dollar data in Component Two that is different from the level designated for collecting and using process and outcome data in Component Three. For example, in instructional areas, it has been most useful to generate and report dollar data at the level of content areas, and outcome and process data for planning and evaluation at least at the level of grades and courses within those content areas, if not at the level of individual classrooms.

The challenge of Component One, therefore, is (1) to identify the hierarchical relationships among current district programs and activities, and (2) to specify where in that hierarchy specific kinds of data should be collected and used in Component Two for program budgeting and cost accounting and in Component Three for program planning and evaluation. To meet this challenge, district staff find it useful to engage in some combination of the following implementation tasks:

- Completion of a questionnaire that is designed to identify, describe and interrelate the district's current array of programs, functions, and activities.
- Use of the information presented in the completed questionnaire to develop a visual display of the hierarchy or structure of those programs, functions, and activities.

- Designation of the specific level of operating programs for which input data should be collected and reported in Component Two and for which outcomes and process data should be collected and used in Component Three.
- Development of specific procedures for reviewing and updating at least once each school year the district's program structure and its designated programs for Component Two and Three data collection

As district staff carry out these four tasks associated with Component One, they will be able to produce two different, but related, information products:

A visual display -- for example, a flowchart or outline -- that (1) is current each school year, (2) indicates clearly the hierarchical relationships among operating programs in the district, and (3) constitutes the district's program structure for program planning, budgeting, cost accounting, and evaluation.

Some indication -- for example, a color or numerical code of the district's program structure -- of the specific levels of operating programs for which cost data will be monitored in Component Two and for which outcome and process data will be monitored in Component Three.

Component Two: Program Budgeting and Cost Accounting

Component Two of SPECS focuses on desired and actual program inputs and helps a school district budget and cost account for its operating programs at whatever level of detail has been specific in

Component One. To develop this program budgeting and cost accounting capability, district staff, primarily in the central office, engage in the following developmental activities:

- Development of a "chart of accounts" -- such as the one presented in the U.S. Office of Education's revised edition of Handbook II, Financial Accounting: Classifications and Standard Terminology for Local and State School Systems 1973* -- that includes, on one dimension, the portion of the district's Component One program structure that has been identified for use in program budgeting and cost accounting; and, on a second dimension, specific "object-cost" categories that can be related to those operating programs that have been disaggregated to a level of detail that assures usefulness of the resulting cost data.
- Development of a coding system for identifying each function and object-cost category in the resulting chart or matrix of accounts.
- Development, if necessary, of a "crosswalk" for relating categories of expenditure in the new program format to those included in the district's earlier line-item format.

---

*Charles T. Roberts and Allan R. Lichtenberger, Financial Accounting: Classifications and Standard Terminology for Local and State School Systems, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office. OE-73-11800, 1973).

- Development of a set of forms and procedures for gathering from building principals, teachers, department chairmen, and others in the district the basic information necessary to (1) recast the district's current operating budget in program format, (2) report current program expenditures, and (3) build budgets for subsequent years in a program format.
- Actual translation of the district's current operating budget from line-item format to progrom format.
- Development of a computerized data-processing system to handle the expected flow of budgetary and expenditure data relevant to each program.

As the members of a district's business office staff gradually implement Component Two and make the district's program budgeting and cost accounting system fully operational, they will be able to produce two additional informational products for the district at regular intervals:

- An annual program budget that presents the projected costs (and eventually, to the extent that Component Three is implemented, the expected outcomes as well) of each program identified in the district's program structure.
- Comparable program accounting reports, prepared at least quarterly for key central office and building personnel, that indicate for each program (1) its budget for the current fiscal year, (2) its expenditures and encumbrances to date, and (3) the balance remaining in the program

account for possible reallocation during the remainder of the fiscal year.

Component Three: Program Planning, Evaluation, and Communication

Component Three makes the SPECS approach to individual program planning and evaluation operational for district staff at the level of specific courses and classrooms. And it encourages staff members to communicate with one another about district programs and to generate and use summary data about their programs as a basis for improving curricular scope and sequence within programs and district-wide articulation across all related programs.

At the level of individual programs, SPECS facilitates efforts by program staff to make explicit for themselves, students, and colleagues, their general and specific plans for each program in which they are involved -- their desired outcomes for the program, the specific processes they will employ to achieve those outcomes, and the resources required to mount those processes. Then, as the processes are actually implemented, SPECS encourages program staff to monitor and document the actual outcomes, processes, and inputs of the program. And finally, at the conclusion of the program, SPECS encourages program staff to evaluate its actual results and identify specific changes that should be made when replanning a next cycle of operation.

To facilitate planning and evaluation of instructional programs, two brief summary documents for highlighting a program's plans and

results and three self-contained booklets for recording detailed information about the program have been developed. The four-page Instructional Program Summary Plan asks those who are responsible for the program to identify, prior to implementation, (1) the overall purposes and characteristics of the program, (2) a small number of its most critical objectives, (3) its overall administrative, instructional, and/or evaluative processes, and (4) its required resources.

The Weekly Lesson Plans booklet focuses on program processes -- the specific instructional methods, procedures, and exercises that will be used -- and includes space for both planning for each day of the program, and evaluating the effectiveness of the processes used. Designed much like a traditional lesson plan book, this booklet is available in two alternative forms -- one for recording forty weeks of plans for only one program, the other for recording forty weeks of plans for up to three programs. Unlike the usual lesson plan book, however, both forms of the process booklet encourage attention to program outcomes and to regular evaluation of the actual processes used in the classroom.

The third booklet, Record of Student Performance, focuses on actual program outcomes and includes pages for recording specific measures of each student's performance on each program objective before, during, and/or after instruction. Together, the Weekly Lesson Plans and the Record of Student Performance replace existing lesson plan books and grade books used by program staff.

Finally, a six-page Program Summary Report asks staff to summarize the program's actual results, including (1) any modifications made in its original critical objectives, (2) actual performance data for all students involved in the program, (3) a brief post facto analysis of the program's processes, (4) a summary of its budgeted and actual costs, and (5) a set of specific recommendations for modifying the program's objectives and/or processes during another cycle of operation.

The three booklets for detailed planning and evaluation of instructional programs have been designed to help the professional staff of a school district carry out their day-to-day responsibilities in particular programs. By contrast, the two program summary documents have been designed to serve other purposes. The Program Summary Plan can be used by program staff during their thinking about a program to identify the program's most critical terminal objectives and general processes, and then to establish a useful context for more detailed program planning and evaluation. Both the Program Summary Plan and its comparable Summary Report can also be used as public documents for "reporting out" to students, colleagues, administrators, board members, and the public at large, on the expected and actual outcomes of a complete program. In a comparable form and manner, summarized information about all programs in a school or district can be regularly collected, shared, and used to improve the curricular scope and sequence of instructional programs and the articulation of all programs across different school buildings and classrooms.

Taken together, Component Three activities and documents are designed to help the staff of a school district describe, monitor, and modify the "what is" state of the district programs -- their plans, their effects upon clients, their revised plans, and their interrelationships across program levels and classrooms. As staff members gradually phase the district's many operating programs -- both instructional and noninstructional -- into Component Three, they engage in the following major implementation tasks:

- Identification, selection, and training of one or more staff members who can coordinate all Component Three activities in the district.
- Development of an appropriate, multi-year schedule for phasing programs, schools, and individual staff members into the use of Component Three documents for program planning and evaluation.
- Design of a series of inservice sessions for district staff members as they become involved in Component Three activities.
- Development of specific procedures for identifying and meeting the continuing inservice needs of staff members as they write objectives, develop evaluative techniques, design relevant procedures, and track actual performance measures on specific program objectives.
- Development by district staff of flowcharts that identify, and interrelate, at increasingly specific levels of detail,

the content, activities, and objectives of those Component Three operating programs that have been identified by name only in Component One.

- Increasing use by district staff of the two SPECS documents for summarizing program plans and results and of the various booklets for detailed program planning and evaluation.
- Development of specific procedures for monitoring and reviewing the plans and results for programs already phased into Component Three.
- Gradual development of new ways of reporting program objectives and performance data to students, parents, future teachers, and other professional staff.
- Development and implementation of specific procedures for summarizing annually the outcome data reported for comparable programs, and for using these data to improve curricular scope and sequence and to increase the articulation of all programs across individual school buildings and classrooms.

As staff members phase various instructional and noninstructional programs into Component Three of SPECS, they will regularly be able to produce two more informational products relevant to the "what is" state of those programs:

- A bank of program planning and evaluation documents, including (1) Program Summary Plans that present an overview of district programs prior to their implementation; (2) comparable Program Summary Reports that indicate results within those programs and specific recommendations for their next cycles of implementation; and (3) specific documents that provide detailed supportive information about each program's objectives, processes, and results.
- A cumulative report prepared annually, if possible, that (1) further summarizes the critical desired and actual outcomes of district programs as they have been reported on Program Summary Reports; (2) recommends specific actions that can be taken to improve curricular scope and sequence, increase program articulation across individual buildings and classrooms, and disseminate information about particularly effective program methods and materials; and (3) serves as the professional staff's input to Component Five by providing a review of the "what is" state of district programs.

Component Four: Community-Based Broad Goal Definition

Component Four: Community-Based Goal Definition is the monitoring system of SPECS. It assumes that a public school district's citizens have both a right and a responsibility to

identify and periodically refine a structure of broad educational goals addressed to the general question, "Given local, state, and national interests, what do we, the citizens of this community, think our schools should be doing for students?"* Furthermore, SPECS assumes that, at least initially, this effort to involve a district's community in broad goal definition can be carried out independently of the district's effort to involve professional staff in systematic program planning and evaluation (Components One, Two, and Three). That is, defining the "what is preferred" state of a district at a macro-level of analysis can occur at any time -- before, during, or after efforts have been made to identify at a more micro-level, that "what is" state of particular district programs.

SPECS does not prescribe a single best way to define a district's community, nor does it specify a single set of procedures for involving that community in defining broad goals or expectations for its schools. Rather, the SPECS materials represent a series of guiding questions related to both products and process that need to be addressed carefully when implementing Component

---

*Note that the focus of goal definition suggested here is upon broad goals rather than specific objectives, and upon instructional or learning outcomes rather than upon instructional processes and methods. In addition, goal definition activities can occur for determining noninstructional activities carried out in a school district.

Four, and they describe in detail one possible strategy for involving a district's community in broad goal definition. Other strategies can range on a continuum from those that ask a community group to generate all goal statements to those that invite a community group simply to rank-order a predetermined list of goal statements.

Regardless of how a district's community is defined or its structure of goals is developed, Component Four, like all of the components of SPECS, should not be viewed as a one-time-only activity. Rather, Component Four should become a continuing set of activities in the district for involving a representative sample of its community in defining the "what is preferred" state of its public schools. It should therefore result in the following informational product:

- A set or structure of broad educational goals that (1) have been generated and reviewed by a representative sample of citizens in the community within the past two or three years, and (2) have been formally accepted or acknowledged by the district's board of education as the community's input to Component Five and its process for periodically and systematically examining the relationship between community expectations and program outcomes.

Component Five: Assessing Achievement of the Organization's Broad Goals

The policy-making subsystem of SPECS is Component Five: Assessing Achievement of the Organization's Broad Goals. It builds upon data generated in the other two subsystems and, as its name implies,

it is most relevant to a district's board of education. By means of a specially constituted committee of professional staff members and/or representatives of a district's community, board members are encouraged periodically to identify, assess, and resolve discrepancies between the current outcomes of school district programs reported in summary form in Component Three, and the broad educational goals defined by the district's community in Component Four. In effect, Component Five is the culminating needs assessment component of SPECS, for it enables all who are involved in the district -- board members professional staff, and citizens -- to identify and deal with any gaps that may exist between the district's actual and preferred states.

When the summarized outcomes of district programs, including both objectives and actual results, are arrayed in Component Five against the district's community-defined educational goals, three kinds of needs assessment questions can be addressed:

- To what degree are the goal statements in the district's goal structure conceptually compatible with one another? Similarly, to what extent are the critical objectives identified within on-going district programs compatible?
- To what degree is there a logical match between the district's program objectives and its broadly defined community expectations?

- Where there is an identifiable match between program objectives and community expectations, are current performance levels on those objectives satisfactory?

As answers to these three questions identify district needs -- for greater consonance, for better matches, or for higher levels of performance within programs -- the district's board of education or its delegated committee can assign priorities to those needs and develop specific strategies for dealing with the needs that are most critical. By controlling district policies and resources, communicating new information to the community, and stimulating the development of new programs and modification of existing programs, board members can influence substantially the future outcomes of district programs, the educational expectations of the district's citizenry, or both.

Even partial implementation of Component Five, therefore, results in yet another informational product in a school district:

- A periodic report that (1) identifies specific district needs for greater consonance between the district's community goals and its program objectives, a better match between the two, and/or higher levels of performance within each program, and (2) includes specific suggestions developed by the district's board or its delegated committee for dealing with the most critical of those needs.

A SCHOOL DISTRICT WANTS TO IMPLEMENT SPECS -- WHAT DO I DO NOW?

Planning for Implementation

The SPECS consultant and district personnel must work closely together; therefore, the question actually becomes not "What do I do?", but "What do we do?"

Based upon the experiences of South Lane School District during the SPECS pilot project and those of nearly a dozen other school districts since the fall of 1973, the following are considered to be extremely important, if not essential, to successful implementation of SPECS in any public school district:

- Several months of careful preparation prior to implementing the system, including orientation sessions for district staff and board members, detailed planning for implementing each of the components, a small scale piloting of the crucial processes and materials.
- A long-term strategy for implementation that gradually phases SPECS into the district -- component by component, school by school, program by program, staff member by staff member.
- A multi-year SPECS Master Plan that has been developed by a representative committee of teachers and administrators, that describes in detail the district's specific strategy for implementation, and that identifies the tasks involved, the indicators and time-lines for their completion, and the personnel responsibility for each.

- An in-district SPECS Coordinator and, if possible, one or more staff members who can serve as Component Three specialists or as building-level coordinators of program planning and evaluation activities.
- Adequate time for staff members to engage in program planning, evaluation, replanning, and articulation, including maximum flexibility in the scheduling and use of that time.
- Sufficient SPECS-related inservice training for district staff members during the early stages of implementation to ensure that they understand the purposes of the system, are in sympathy with them, can carry them out, and understand the alternative uses of the SPECS instructional operational materials -- especially the documents for planning and evaluating instructional and noninstructional programs.
- Adequate resources to provide additional inservice training for district staff members as they become increasingly involved in defining program objectives, gathering actual student performance data, designing new curricular and instructional processes, using output data as a basis for allocating resources among competing programs, and so forth.
- A management system for SPECS that permits flexibility and experimentation, maintains open channels of communication among district staff at all levels, and encourages staff members to share their concerns, discuss them openly, and deal with them collectively.

- Implementation guidelines and policy statements that clarify important issues related to the implementation of SPECS and are broadly disseminated and periodically reviewed. Such issues might include the relationship of program and student results to teacher evaluation, the district's timeline for phasing programs in Component Three documentation, the private or public use of Program Summaries and of detailed planning and evaluation documents, and the freedom of district staff members to deviate from procedures recommended by SPECS or by district administrators.
- An advisory committee that represents divergent points of view, and a set of procedures that committee members can use throughout the implementation period to monitor SPECS-related activities, solicit reactions, and recommend modifications of either SPECS or the particular processes being used in the district to implement it.
- Clearly defined annual decision-points in the implementation process at which times reports can be prepared and presented to the district's board of education -- reports that document the prior year of SPECS-related activities in the district and recommend that either (1) implementation of the system be continued as planned, (2) it be continued, but with specific modifications, or (3) it be terminated for certain specific reasons.

To achieve these objectives, district personnel typically engage in some combination of the following preparatory acitivities:

- Identification of an individual or small group that can assume primary responsibility for designing and coordinating the district's SPECS preparatory activities.
- Presentations, workshops, and meetings that introduce SPECS to an increasing number of district staff members and that help develop staff sensitivity to the need for more explicit program budgeting and cost accounting, more systematic program planning, better program articulation, and more data-based program evaluation.
- Development of an initial data base in the district relevant to existing programs -- descriptions of them, their current budgets and costs, their current objectives, indications of their effectiveness, and any other information that may be available.
- Pilot use of some of the SPECS operational documents (particularly those relevant to Component Three) by a small number of staff members who can later report on their experiences and make specific recommendations for further use of the documents in the district.
- Creation and in-depth training of a planning committee consisting of six to ten key staff members in the district, including teachers, building and central office administrators, and the one or two individuals who will serve as the district's internal SPECS Coordinators.

- Development by the planning committee of a comprehensive multi-year master plan for implementation of SPECS.

Developing the Master Plan

Developing the district's Master Plan for implementation is one of the most critical of all SPECS preparatory activities. To the extent possible, the plan should span three or four years of implementation, indicating in some detail how the district plans to phase into each component of SPECS. It should describe, for example, the general goals to be met during the first three years of implementation, the specific implementation tasks that will be carried out each year, and the indicators that will be used to assess their completion. It should describe how the district will manage SPECS, how implementation will be coordinated at the district, building, and classroom levels, and who ultimately will be responsible for each task. It should include guidelines for providing necessary staff inservice training, descriptions of the outside consultation anticipated, and estimates of the initial and continuing costs of implementation to the district. And it should include clear go/no-go decision points scattered throughout the implementation period.

A district's Master Plan ought to describe clearly both its long-range intentions for SPECS -- where it expects to be three or four years into implementation -- as well as its detailed plans for at least the first year or two of activity. Although these intentions are likely to be in a state of continual review and revision once implementation begins, they ought to be clearly

understood prior to a decision to implement.

The culmination of this second phase of SPECS-related activities is a formal go/no-go decision by a school district's board of education that indicates (1) its philosophical support of the intentions described in the Master Plan and (2) its operational and budgetary support for at least the first year or two of proposed implementation activities. Although the specific criteria and procedures for reaching this decision will vary among school boards, each will probably want to include a careful review of the district's Master Plan, an assessment of staff reactions to what they know of SPECS and may have experienced on a pilot basis, and a systematic analysis of the relative costs and benefits of implementing SPECS rather than some other system for data-based program planning and evaluation. Included here is a portion of one district's Master Plan.*

*Taken from Bremerton, Washington School District Master Plan

An Example of a Master Plan

Indicators of Task Completion	Relevant Dates	Personnel Responsible and Involved
1.11 A set of flowcharts that (a) display Bremerton's structure of on-going activities and (b) identify its "operating programs" for the 1973-74 school year	Flowcharts completed by 12-1-73	Manion, Wisely, Kremer, Ryan, and building principals
1.21 Specific procedures that describe who will do what, when, and how to up-date quarterly the flowcharts of on-going activities and "operating programs"	Procedures developed by 1-15-74	Manion, Wisely, Kremer, Ryan, and building principals
1.22 An up-dated set of flowcharts for each quarter of each school year	Flowcharts completed by the start of each quarter	Manion, Wisely, Kremer, Ryan, and building principals
2.11 A proposal from General Learning Corporation that specifies alternative ways by which the Bremerton School District can develop the necessary computer software and hardware to implement Component Two of SPECS	Proposal presented by 12-1-73	DuVall and Johnson
2.12 Identification and adoption of the specific procedures that will be used in the district to develop computer capability to handle Component Two demands	Procedures developed and adopted by 2-1-74	Ryan and Manion
2.13 A set of flowcharts that display the object-cost categories relevant to any or all on-going activities and "operating programs" in the district	Flowcharts completed by 12-1-73	Ryan and Manion
2.14 Bremerton's resulting "chart of accounts" of activities and object-cost categories--its Total Direct Cost Activity Matrix (TDCAM)	TDCAM completed 1-1-74	Manion and Ryan

Indicators of Task Completion	Relevant Dates	Personnel Responsible and Involved
3.11 A description of the role of a SPECS Building Coordinator	Description developed by 11-15-73	Johnson, Wisely, Kremer, Berry, and Manion
3.12 A revision (if necessary) of that initial role description	Revision completed by 5-1-74	Manion, Wisely, Kremer, Berry, and Johnson
3.13 Criteria, procedures, and schedules for identifying the district's initial cadre of Building Coordinators, including a formal announcement of the number and location of positions to be filled	Criteria, procedures, and schedules developed by 11-15-73	Manion, Wisely, Kremer, Berry, Johnson, and building principals
3.14 Recruitment and selection of the initial cadre of Coordinators, resulting in a list of the selected individual(s) in each school	Selection process conducted between 11-15 and 12-21-73	Berry, building principals, Wisely, Kremer, and Manion
3.15 Criteria (based upon the role description in 3.11) and specific procedures for evaluating the performance of individual Coordinators	Criteria and procedures developed by 12-15-73	Wisely, Kremer, Berry, Manion, Johnson, and building principals
3.16 Periodic evaluation reports on the performance of individual Coordinators	Reports prepared at least annually	Berry, Wisely, Kremer, building principals, and the SPECS Building Coordinators
3.17 Revised criteria, procedures, and schedules for identifying new Coordinators as that becomes necessary	Revision completed by 5-1-74	Manion, Wisely, Kremer, Berry, and building principals
3.18 Recruitment and selection of any new Coordinators, resulting in a revised roster by school	Selection process completed by 6-1 of each year	Berry, building principals, Wisely, Kremer, and Manion

Indicators of Task Completion	Relevant Dates	Personnel Responsible and Involved
3.63 Presentation of the summaries to each school's staff prior to the start of each school year	Presentations made between 9-1 and 9-15 each year	Wisely, Manion, SPECS Building Coordinators, and building principals
3.64 A proposal from General Learning Corporation that specifies alternative ways by which the Bremerton School District can develop a computerized output accounting and reporting system	Proposal presented by 4-30-74	DuVall and Johnson
3.65 Development of the specific procedures that will be used in the district to develop its computerized system for output accounting and reporting	District procedures developed by 7-1-74	Wisely, Manion, Johnson, building principals, and SPECS Building Coordinators
3.66 Implementation of the district's procedures	Pilot implementation begun during the 1974-1975 school year	Wisely, Manion, Johnson, building principals, and SPECS Building Coordinators
4.11 A proposal from General Learning Corporation that specifies three or four alternative ways by which the Bremerton School District can implement Component Four of SPECS, generate its initial set of community-defined broad educational goals, and periodically review and revise that set of goals	Proposal presented by 4-30-74	DuVall and Johnson
4.12 Development and adoption of the specific procedures that will be used in the district to generate and later revise the district's set of community-defined broad educational goals	District procedures developed and adopted by 7-1-74	Fjeran, Wisely, Manion, and Johnson
4.13 Implementation of the procedures and generation of the district's initial set of community-defined broad educational goals	Implementation begun by 9-1-74 and completed by 7-1-75	Manion, Wisely, Johnson, and a specially constituted Component Four Community Advisory Committee

	Indicators of Task Completion	Relevant Dates	Personnel Responsible and Involved
6.11	A chart that indicates clearly how the management of SPECS will be related to the management of other activities in the district--who will be involved in SPECS and how those individuals will relate formally to one another	Chart completed by 11-15-73	Fjeran, Wisely, Manion, and Johnson
6.12	Descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of each of the following during the implementation and operation of SPECS: the district's SPECS Coordinator, SPECS Building Coordinators, building principals, teachers, key central office administrators, members of the board of education, and the district's evaluator	Descriptions completed by 11-15-73	Johnson, Fjeran, Wisely and Manion
6.13	A set of procedures for monitoring and assessing the degree to which each role and responsibility is actually being carried out--that is, that each indicator of implementation has been completed	Procedures completed by 11-15-73	Johnson and Manion
6.21	Descriptions of various incentives that encourage such SPECS-related activities as (a) planning, evaluating, and replanning programs with the SPECS documents, (b) using the program cost data generated, (c) using the program output data generated, (d) developing new ways of reporting student performance, etc.	Incentives developed and implemented as appropriate, beginning 12-1-73	Wisely, Manion, Johnson, building principals, and SPECS Building Coordinators. More specifically, Manion responsible for (a), Johnson for (b), and Wisely responsible for (c) and (d)
6.31	Descriptions of procedures that will facilitate communication about SPECS within the district itself as well as between the district and parents, others in the community, the press, other districts, the state department, etc.	Procedures developed and implemented as appropriate, beginning 11-15-73	Wisely, Manion, and Johnson, working with appropriate personnel inside and outside the district

TAKING THE NEXT STEPS --
WHICH WAY DO I GO?

Let's assume for a moment that you have just recently read all you can find about SPECS, you have an educational organization -- a school district or community college with personnel who are eager and interested, and together, you've written a Master Plan. What is the next step?

Depending upon the specific needs of the organization, the next step probably would be to plan and hold a workshop with you, the SPECS consultant, leading the way. To help you with this task, a workshop agenda has been included. This agenda has been used numerous times by various consultants in numerous school districts in all parts of this country. It is not cast in concrete, but rather in ink; therefore, you can alter it as you believe appropriate to meet the needs of the specific organization. Also included is a checklist of items to remember when conducting a workshop and a sample evaluation form. Again, you may wish to add or delete certain items.

In addition to the agenda, checklist, and evaluation form, a Materials Use and User Chart is included. The purpose of this chart is to help you identify at a glance the specific material appropriate for the group with which you're working. You may wish to use the Comments section to make your own notes about the materials.

Keep in mind that explanation about the use of the materials is provided in the implementation manuals* as well as on the specific material.

*Nagle, John M., Harold E. Walker, and Lloyd A. DuVall, The Component One Implementation Booklet: A Systems Analysis of a School District, University of Oregon, 1976.

*DuVall, Lloyd A., The Component Two Implementation Booklet: Program Budgeting and Cost Accounting, University of Oregon, 1976.

*Cole, Barbara, Harold E. Walker, and Jack M. Nagle, The Component Three Implementation Booklet: Instructional Program Planning, Evaluation and Communication, University of Oregon, 1976.

*Cole, Barbara, The Component Five Implementation Booklet: Assessing Achievement of the District's Broad Goals, University of Oregon, 1976.

Outline for SPECS Orientation Workshop

I. Introduction

A. SPECS -- What It Is

1. Acronym
   a. School Planning, Evaluation and Communication System; a system that may be used in part or in whole
2. Information system for decision makers
   a. Provides information on organizational structure, costs and budgeting, program outcomes, community expectations, and provides a way to relate this information for policy making
3. One form of PPBS
   a. Designed specifically for use in educational settings

B. SPECS Development

1. Developed at Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon
   a. Pilot tested in South Lane School District, Cottage Grove, Oregon
   b. Field tested in fourteen school districts and one community college

C. PPBS

1. Military and industrial usage
   a. Introduced in Department of Defense in mid-1960's
   b. Subsequent mandate to use in all federal agencies
   c. State legislation requiring its use in schools
2. Potential advantages to educators
   a. Provides information for decision makers which other approaches cannot provide
   b. (See final sections of the implementation manuals)

II. The Contents of SPECS

A. The Operating Subsystem of SPECS

1. Component One: A Systems Analysis of the School District
   a. Develop the idea of building a program structure
   b. See Component I Manual
2. Component Two: Program Budgeting and Cost Accounting
   a. Build total direct cost matrix from the illustrative Component I flowchart
   b. See Component II Manual
3. Component Three: Program Planning, Evaluation, and Communication
   a. Program goals and source objective development
   b. Data collection
   c. See Component III Manual

B. The Monitoring Subsystem of SPECS

1. Component Four: Community-Based Broad Goal Definition
   a. Two types of goals -- outcome and process
   b. See Component IV Manual

C. The Policy-Making Subsystem of SPECS

1. Component Five: Assessing Achievement of the District's Broad Goals
   a. Data collection from Components I, II, III, IV
   b. A matching process -- program outcomes and community expectations

III. Implementing SPECS

A. What are the necessary decisions?

1. Materials: Which materials do we need? Should we write our own? When could the materials arrive?
2. Budgets & Resources: How much will implementation of each of the components cost? Do we need additional consultation? Do we need computer time? Will additional inservice be needed?
3. Target Dates: When will the decisions be made?
4. Responsibilities: Who is going to order the materials? Who will call the next meeting? Who is responsible for assuring that all the work gets done for each component?
5. Evaluation: How and when will we evaluate if SPECS is doing what we expect it to do?

Workshop Checklist for the SPECS Consultant

Yes	No		
___	___	1.	Do I have a copy of the agenda for the Workshop?
___	___	2.	Have I listed all the materials used during the Workshop?
___	___	3.	Do I have a separate list of the names, titles, and responsibilities of all persons participating in the Workshop?
___	___	4.	Am I and others fully aware of the purpose of the Workshop?
___	___	5.	Do I know how participants were selected to participate in the Workshop?
___	___	6.	Am I ready to suggest some next steps following the Workshop?
___	___	7.	Do I know which component to emphasize? For what reason?
___	___	8.	Do I know the major concerns of the participants?
___	___	9.	Do I have an evaluation form that will allow participants to evaluate my work?

Sample of SPECS Workshop Evaluation Form

1. Did the objectives of the Workshop meet your needs at this particular time?

2. Were the objectives stated clearly at the beginning of the Workshop?

3. Was the material presented clearly?

4. List any materials or activities which might have been made the material more useful to you.

5. Make any comments you wish about the following:

   Workshop Time:

   Workshop Location:

   Workshop Date:

   Workshop Schedule:

   Workshop Audio Visuals:

SPECS Materials Use and User Chart

MATERIALS	USER	PURPOSE	COMMENTS
SPECS: What It Is and What It Does	1) Any person or group considering implementation of any component of the sytem. Such persons may include Board members, district managers, and teachers.	1) Provide overview of system 2) Understand conceptual framework of SPECS	
Component One: A Systems Analysis of a School District	1) Management of the organization 2) Personnel responsible for implementing Component One	1) Understand the purposes for completing Component One 2) Learn three different methods of doing a systems analysis of a school district	
Component Two: Program Budgeting and Cost Accounting	1) Assistant Superintendent for Business, Business Manager	1) Understand the purpose for program budgeting 2) Know steps necessary to complete a program budget	

SPECS Materials Use and User Chart

MATERIALS	USER	PURPOSE	COMMENTS
Component Three: Instructional Program Planning, Evaluation, and Coordination	1) SPECS Coordinator 2) Curriculum Director 3) Team leaders 4) Teachers 5) Instructional aides 6) Principals	1) Understand the process of instructional planning & evaluating 2) Knowing specific steps in inplementing Component Three 3) Viewing samples of Component Three materials in use	
Component Three: Record of Instructional Objectives	1) Principal 2) Team leaders 3) Teachers 4) Instructional aides	1) Writing program objectives and achievement indicators 2) Specifying proposed changes in program objectives	
Component Three: Record of Student Performance	1) Teachers 2) Instructional aides	1) Recording student performance on objectives	

SPECS Materials Use and User Chart

MATERIALS	USER	PURPOSE	COMMENTS
Component Three: Instructional Program Summary Plan	1) Principal 2) Team leader 3) Teachers	1) Present description of proposed programs, including critical objectives, planned assessment & instructional procedures	
Component Three: Weekly Lesson Plans (for 1 program)	1) Principal 2) Team leader 3) Teachers 4) Instructional aides 5) Substitute teachers	1) Presenting the objective on which the instruction will be focused 2) Present processes & resources needed 3) Evaluate procedures 4) Recommend changes	
Component Three: Weekly Lesson Plans for up to 3 programs	1) Principal 2) Team leader 3) Teachers 4) Instructional aides 5) Substitute teachers	1) Presenting the objectives on which the instruction will be focused 2) Present processes & resources needed 3) Evaluate procedures 4) Recommend changes	

SPECS Materials Use and User Chart

MATERIALS	USERS	PURPOSE	COMMENTS
Component Four:	1) Administration 2) Policy making body, i.e., Board of Education 3) SPECS Coordinator	1) Provide assistance in developing a goal definition strategy	
Component Four: A supplement to the Component Four Implementation Booklet	1) Administration 2) Policy making body, i.e., Board of Education 3) SPECS Coordinator	1) Viewing simulated district's goal development strategy	
Component Five: Assessing the District's Board Goals	1) Administration 2) Policy making body 3) SPECS Coordinator 4) Task Force members	1) Understand steps involved in completing Component Five 2) View of how one school district completed Component Five	

SPECS Terminology

Achievement Indicator -- includes an observable act, conditions or givens, and the expected level of quality of performance.

Actual -- demonstrated outcomes or behaviors.

Affective Domain -- objectives which describe changes in interests, attitude and values, and development of appreciations and adequate adjustment.[1]

Assessment Procedure -- method/manner of determining successful completion of an objective/s.

Behavior -- actions, conduct, responses to stimuli.

Cognitive Domain -- objectives which deal with recall or recognition of knowledge and the development of intellectual abilities and skills.[2]

Condition -- the set of circumstances, constraints, or the setting which exist during the time that a certain behavior is being exhibited.

Decision Rule -- criterion for making judgements.

Demonstrate -- behave in such a way that another person could observe the behavior.

Desired -- planned outcome or behavior.

Exhibit -- show, demonstrate, perform.

Given -- the set of circumstances or situation that the learner is provided prior to being expected to behave in certain ways.

---

1. Bloom, Benjamin S., (ed.) and others. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook I: Cognitive Domain (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956), p. 7.

2. Ibid., p. 7.

Instructional - activities directly related to teaching.

Non-Instructional - activities supportive of the Instructional process but not directly a part of the process. Examples of non-instructional activities include services such as bus transportation and custodial services.

Objectives -- several types of objectives are included in the SPECS materials. Objectives differ from goals in that objectives are more specific and are measurable in most instances. Exceptions may be found in the affective domain. The following terms relate to differing kinds of objectives, although some may be overlapping.

Behavioral: often used synonymously with performance objectives. Specific behaviors of the student which must be able to be seen by an observer, usually the instructor.

Critical: objective judged to be the most important of a set of objectives.

Focal: a specific objective that would be given the greatest amount of attention within a particular time period.

General: gives the intent of the expected behaviors.

Performance: specifically states the behaviors that must be demonstrated before an observer can say that an objective can be met.

Program: general objective written for a particular large curriculum area such as Reading, Career Education, or Science.

Terminal: performance objective for the end of a unit, course, or program.

Observerable Act -- behavior that can be seen by another person.

Post-Test -- examination given to student after instruction.

Processes -- methods for performing specified task.

Program -- a plan of activities and procedures designed to accomplish a predetermined objective or set of allied objectives.

Program Element -- one portion of a program such as a unit in a social studies program.

Psychomotor -- manipulative or motor-skill area.[3]

Satisfy -- to meet requirements listed in the objective.

Skill -- ability, knowledge, understanding.

Student Performance Data -- narrative or numerical information about demonstrated student achievement.

---

3. Bloom, Benjamin S., (ed.) and others. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook I: Cognitive Domain (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956), p. 7.

Examples of SPECS Materials as Modified

by Site Personnel

WALL TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Wall, New Jersey

PB Form A

PROGRAM PLAN FORM

I PROGRAM NAME

II DESIRED GOALS OF PROGRAM - WHAT THE PROGRAM WOULD ACCOMPLISH DURING THE BUDGET YEAR

III PROGRAM DESCRIPTION - BRIEF NARRATIVE OF HOW PROGRAM IN CONDUCTED: METHODOLOGY: THE TYPE OF CLIENTELE SERVED AND THE FREQUENCY OF SERVICE: KINDS OF PERSONNEL, FACILITIES, MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS.

PB Form B

WALL TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Wall, New Jersey

PROGRAM BUDGET REQUEST
Continuing Programs

PROGRAM _____ LOCATION _____

100 Salaries — No. — Type — Amt. of Time Spent in Program

Professional

Non-Professional

300 Purchased Services - Purchased services rendered by personnel who are not employees of the district, e.g., consultants.

400 Supplies and Materials

410 Supplies

420 Texts

430 Library Books

440 Periodicals

450 Audio-Visual Software

480 Other

500 Capital Outlay

530 Renovations

540-1 New Equipment - Justify

540-2 Replacement Equipment - Justify and explain disposition of old equipment.

WALL TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Wall, New Jersey

List Certified
Staff First

STAFFING DATA 1975-1976 BUDGET

BUDGET PROGRAM NO._____ _____

BUDGET PROGRAM _____

Staff Member	% of Time in Program	Program Salary	Program Benefits	Total
TOTALS:				

Other Employee Benefits: _____

Notes: _____

_____ _____

PB Form F

WALL TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Wall, New Jersey

SUPPORT DATA - NON-PERSONNEL

Budget Request - 1975 - 1976

PROGRAM _____ LOCATION _____

ACCOUNT NUMBER _____

ACCOUNT NUMBER _____

Quantity	Catalog No.	Item Description	Unit Cost	Total

TOTAL _____

WALL TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Wall, New Jersey

PB Form G

EXPLANATION OF ALTERNATIVE FOR PROGRAM CHANGE

PROGRAM _____ BUDGET YEAR _____

Alternative # _____ of Program Change CHANGE # _____

Description of Alternative process for obtaining the benefit:

ACCOUNT TITLE	First Year ( )	Cost * Second Year ( )	Third Year ( )
PERSONNEL COSTS:			
Title / Number of Positions / Average Salary Cost			
NON-PERSONNEL COSTS:			
TOTAL			

ADVANTAGES OF ALTERNATIVE:

DISADVANTAGES OF ALTERNATIVE:

*Use current costs and salary for projections.

WALL TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Wall, New Jersey

PB Form H

PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSAL

PROGRAM _____ PROPOSED BY _____

BUDGET YEAR _____ CHANGE # _____

PROGRAM CHANGE DESCRIPTION: Describe the major elements of the program change, including target group to be served.

Benefits: Desired change and benefits to be obtained from new or change program rather than how the change will be accomplished.

Alternative Description:

Alternative ways (How) to accomplish change- in priority order		TOTAL COST*	
	First Year ( )	Second Year ( )	Third Year ( )
A.			
B.			
C.			

*Use current costs and salary rates for all projections

WALL TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Wall, New Jersey

PB Form J

BUILDING BUDGET COMPILATION WORKSHEET
PERSONNEL AND NON-PERSONNEL REQUESTS

Program	Salaries	Employee Benefits	Purchased Services	Supplies Materials and Equipment	Other Objects	Current Year's Requests	Previous Year's Approved Budget
Total							

DATE: _____

PREPARED BY: _____

APPROVED BY: _____

WALL TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Wall, New Jersey

PB Form K

DISTRICT-WIDE BUDGET COMPILATION WORKSHEET
PERSONNEL AND NON-PERSONNEL REQUESTS

Programs	Salaries	Employee Benefits	Purchased Services	Materials and Equipment	Other Objects	Current Year's Requests	Previous Year's Approved Budget
Total							

DATE: _____

PREPARED BY: _____

APPROVED BY: _____

WALL TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Wall, New Jersey

PROGRAM_____ LOCATION_____

100 Salaries		1974-75	Revisions	1975-1976	Notes
110	Certified Number				
111	Regular				
112	Temporary				
113	Extra Duty				
120	Non-Certified Number				
121	Regular				
122	Temporary				
123	Overtime				
	100 TOTAL				
200	Employee Benefits				
210	Certified				
220	Non-Certified				
	200 TOTAL				
300	Purchased Services				
310	Professional and Technical				
320	Property Services				
330	Transportation				

(Continued)

PROGRAM _____ LOCATION _____

		1974-1975	Revisions	1975-1976	Notes
300	Purchased Services (Continued)				
340	Communication				
350	Advertising				
360	Printing and Binding				
370	Tuition				
380	Other				
	300 TOTAL				
400	Supplies & Materials				
410	Supplies				
420	Textbooks				
430	Library Books				
440	Periodicals				
450	Audio Visual Software				
460	Food				
480	Other				
	400 TOTAL				

(Continued)

PROGRAM _____ LOCATION _____

500 Capital Outlay		1974-1975	Revisions	1975-76	Notes
520	Remodeling				
530	Improvements - Other than building				
540-1	Equipment - New				
540-2	Equipment - Replacement				
550-1	Vehicles - New				
550-2	Vehicles - Replacement				
560	Other				
	500 TOTAL				
	PROGRAM TOTAL				

Cosmetology I

PROGRAM ELEMENT: ORIENTATION

OBJECTIVE: Student will explain basic facts of the Cosmetology lab for beginners, including safety and sanitary measures, the attributes a cosmetologist must personally achieve, and laws that regulate cosmetology schools and shops.

	Observable Act	Conditions or Givens	Level of Quality
A1-1	Describe 4 areas of the Cosmetology Lab.	By listing on paper the functions of safety and sanitary practices of each area in the lab.	70%-90% accuracy
A1-2	Create a favorable impression on co-workers, patrons, employers.	By listing and demonstrating the desired personal attributes of hygiene, personality and grooming.	
A1-3	Demonstrate public sanitary measures	Chart the agencies and their functions	90% accuracy
A1-4	List the Cosmetology laws of the State of N.H.	In writing, answer 25 questions.	90% accuracy 22 out of 25 correct
A1-5	Knowing the existance and spread of micro-organisms.	On paper from a list of types of bacteria, identify and give growth and spread of each.	90% accuracy
A1-6	Demonstrate sterilization measures.	Given chemicals and formulas.	100% accuracy

PROGRAM ELEMENT: HAIRSTYLING

OBJECTIVE: Student will demonstrate ability to design, mold, and secure a smooth pincurl.

	Observable Act	Conditions or Givens	Level of Quality
A1-1	Demonstration of design in pincurling.	On a mannequin, create bases and design matching curls.	Criteria set by instructor and hair analysis
A1-2	Demonstrate molding hair with comb and fingers.	On a mannequin, create right going and left going shapings.	100% accuracy
A1-3	Show implements used to secure pincurl.	From a group of implements select those for pincurl and demonstrate use.	100% accuracy
A1-4	Reproduce setting patterns on top and side of the head.	On a mannequin, with a set of patterns to reproduce.	90-100% accuracy according to patterns.
A1-5	Show related work in pincurling	25 questions.	20 out of 25 correct

Cosmetology II

PROGRAM ELEMENT: ORIENTATION REVIEW

OBJECTIVE: The student will be able to explain basic facts of Cosmetology lab safety and sanitary rules, personal attributes necessary for a Cosmetologist, and laws that regulate schools and salons.

	Observable Act	Conditions or Givens	Level of Quality
A1-1	Demonstrate shop lab areas.	Label a chart and explain.	90% accuracy
A1-2	Demonstrate safety and sanitary rules.	List the 20 rules.	90% accuracy
A1-3	Demonstrate personal qualities of a Cosmetologist.	Necessary qualifications.	90% accuracy
A1-4	Demonstrate shop and salon rules and laws.	Listing and explaining shop laws.	90% accuracy

PROGRAM ELEMENT: WIGS

OBJECTIVE: The student will demonstrate the care and use of various types of hair pieces.

	Observable Act	Conditions or Givens	Level of Quality
A1-1	Demonstrate wig fitting and care.	On a head block adjust, shape, curl, rinse, and condition wig.	According to instruction.
A1-2	Demonstrate correct selection of wig.	On a live model, select, measure, cut and set or comb to desired style.	According to customer's wishes.
A1-3	Demonstrate types and qualities of wigs.	In an essay, discuss types and quality of wigs on the market.	According to information gathered.

PROGRAM ELEMENT;

OBJECTIVE:

	Observable Act	Conditions or Givens	Level of Quality

PROGRAM ELEMENT: HAIR WAVING AND STRAIGHTENING

OBJECTIVE: The student will describe the effects of chemicals on hair by demonstrating the application in thermal pressing and styling in hair relaxing and permanent waving.

	Observable Act	Conditions or Givens	Level of Quality
A1-1	Demonstrate formation and removal of curls using hot irons.	On a mannequin, using tools, creams, oils, and pomades and proper procedures.	Manufacturer's instructions
A1-2	Demonstrate relaxation of hair with chemicals.	On a head of curly hair using chemicals, tools, and proper procedure.	Manufacturer's instructions
A1-3	Give a permanent wave.	On a mannequin, selecting proper rods, solutions, and techniques.	Hair analysis and manufacturer's instructions.
A1-4	Related theory.	150 questions in writing.	140 out of 150 correct

PROPOSAL - SPECS AND PARADISE CANYON
April 28, 1975

PROPOSAL

It is recommended that Paradise Canyon become involved with SPECS on a building level with the intent to operate components II, III, IV and possibly V.

RATIONALE

The State of California has laid a good ground work for us since PPBS beginnings (SPECS component II), since requiring community based goals (IV) and with the Stull Bill requirements to teaching by objectives (III). This system approach is basically a way of record keeping that allows for a common sense, data based, decision making process in curriculum endeavors.

SPECS TASKS

1. Start with 5 teachers on a K-3 level to set up continuous progress curriculum endeavors for component III.

2. Allow these 5 teachers summer '75 curriculum writing time between 60 - 80 total hours.

3. Bring in the SPECS consultant, Dr. Rasmussen, CSULA, two or three times between the summer work and school year ending.

4. Provide the 5 teachers with a 6 hour instructional aide from the district floating staff unit this first year of implementation. The aim shall be to gradually shift the record keeping process to parent aides.

5. Allow 1/2 day release time periodically (8 - 10 times) during the school year for the team to plan and evaluate.

6. Purchase the necessary record sheets from SPECS center (at cost) to do all desired components.

7. Allow team individuals to participate in SPECS nation wide conference during '75 - '76 school year.

8. The principal to involve herself in actually doing a mini-course using component III; to work with Assistant Superintendent of Business in component II; to work with PTA and school attendance zone to put into priority district goals for component IV, and with the K-8 Director of Curriculum in looking at curriculum in relation to goals.

ANTICIPATED COSTS	Minimum	Maximum
5 Teachers summer work at $35 hour for 60-80 hours	$2100	$2800
6 Hour Instructional Aides (.375 S.U. (allocation)	4000?	4000?
Substitutes for released time 8-10 times for 5 teachers (rate 1/2 day = $95)	760	950
SPECS consultant - 2 or 3 times during year @$150. each unit	300	450
Materials from SPECS	50	90
SPEC Conference expenses for 2 meetings during year For 2 to 4 people from bldg. (Approx. $100. per) (SPECS shares the expense)	200	400
Calls to SPECS center people at will	0	0
Visits from SPECS center people	0	0
Total expense	$7410 Minimum	to $8690 Maximum

OUTCOMES

1. Preparation for ECE continuum/individualization/objective/writing/evaluation/revamping. It is understood that should Paradise Canyon receive ECE monies that the expense of this proposal shall be written into our objectives and thereby reimbursement to the district would be accomplished.

2. Should create into objectives written by teachers an individual mastery level agreed upon a grade level basis. After the first year the needs of a group of children can be based on concrete data, other than CTBS testing.

3. Such a cost cut could guide in the allocation of building $$ to a method other than straight per pupil basis.

4. SPECS is compatible with our philosophy in that teachers do their own "how" - after agreement is reached on the "what".

5. Gives the first sound basis for interpreting a mark of ABC that I have seen.

6. Reduces text book teaching.

7. Gives teachers a method of handling pre/post testing. Affords means to get away from so much paper pencil pre/post testing

to teacher judgment as an acceptable basis considered concrete data.

8. Could be the basis for District Curriculum Guides that would not be shelved and looked at once or twice yearly only.

9. Provides an opportunity to develop a continuous progress that extends the fine individualization in assessing needs as seen in our kindergarten Santa Clara tool.

10. Provides valuable outcome data if compared to goals.

Ev Alsberg

Unit Plan: Machines

Dover, New Hampshire

Program Title: Simple Machines; Magnets — Program Code:

School Year 1974-1975 — Semester 1st — Program Dates:

Program Planner: Mrs. Davenport

General Objectives of the Program (which will be transferred into performance objectives)

1.1 That students have some understanding of simple machines.

1.2 That students gain some knowledge of magnets and their attributes.

1.3 That students understand that electricity can create a magnetic field.

General Objectives of the Program (which will not be transferred into performance objectives)

1.1 That students develop an appreciation of the many machines used in our daily lives.

1.2 That students develop enjoyment of science.

1.3 That students appreciate the pattern and beauty of life.

1.4 That students apply some of the knowledge gained in their everyday living.

Required Processes	Evaluation of Unit	Replacing of Unit
Science for Here and Now Pages 10 - 19 Pages 35 - 43 TM Various simple machines to name. Describe use. Draw simple machines need at school, home, play.		
Science for Here and Now Pages 10 - 19 Pages 35 - 43 TM Experiment with pencils (for rollers) under books Construct simple box. Move with set of wheels Experiment with toy cars, inclined plane (board) Experiment with small pulley, heavy objects		
Science for Here and Now Page 152 - 154 Search for Ideas Pages 4 - 10 Magnets Variety of materials - magnetic and non-magnetic		
Overhead Transparency - Fields of Force Search for Ideas Pages 11 - 13 Experiment to locate most forceful part of magnet Materials needed - magnets		
Science for Here and Now Pages 157 - 158 143 - 154 TM Search for Ideas Pages 16 - 17 Experiment with north-south combinations Materials needed - magnets		
Search for Ideas Pages 14 - 15 Experiment to discover magnets force through various materials Materials needed - magnets, wood, paper, water, cloth		
Science for Here and Now Pages 133 - 156 Search for Ideas Pages 18 - 19 Make magnet using needle, magnet		
Science for Here and Now Pages 163 - 165 Search for Ideas Pages 20 - 21 Experiment with compass to see where needle points, affect of magnet on compass Make simple compass with cork, needle, magnet, pan of water		
Encyclopedia Book of Knowledge Compton's Junior If possible, acquire piece of lodestone Read and discuss properties and value		
Science for Here and Now Pages 159 - 161 Make and experiment with electromagnet Dry cell, copper wire, large nail, materials to test force		
Science for Here and Now Page 162 Make bell ring using magnet Bell, dry cell, copper wire		
Make moter run, using electromagnet Dry cell, copper wire, small motor Filmstrips - New Electricity Helps Current Electricity		

Related Performance Objectives

General Objectives	Performance Objectives	Evaluative Processes	Required Proficiency
1.1 Understanding of simple machines (Go into this unit as follow up from building material unit)	1.1 a Be able to recognize simple machines such as pencil, eraser, magnet, knife, fork, etc.	Oral	To satisfaction of teacher
	1.1 b Be able to recognize and differentiate between gears, wheels, pulleys, inclined planes	Oral	To satisfaction of teacher
1.2 Have some knowledge of magnets	1.2 a Identify magnetic and non-magnetic materials	Oral	To satisfaction of teacher
	1.2 b Identify the poles of magnet, pattern of poles	Oral	To satisfaction of teacher
	1.2 c Recognize which poles attract, and which repel	Oral	To satisfaction of teacher
	1.2 d Understand that a magnet can act through non-magnetic materials	Oral	To satisfaction of teacher
	1.2 e Demonstrate how to make a permanent magnet	Oral	To satisfaction of teacher
	1.2 f Be able to tell why a magnetic compass works	Oral	To satisfaction of teacher
	1.2 g Have some knowledge of the properties of lodestone	Oral	To satisfaction of teacher

1.3 Have an understanding of electricity's capability to create a magnetic field	1.3 a Make an on-off magnet with dry soil wire and nail.	Oral	To satisfaction of teacher
	1.3 b Experiment with dry cell, magnet and bell	Oral	To satisfaction of teacher
	1.3 c Experiment with electro-magnet and small motor	Oral	To satisfaction of teacher

1. ORIENTATION
2. FUNDAMENTALS
3. SKETCHING
4. GEOMETRICS
5. CHARTS & GRAPHICS
6. DIMENSIONING
7. WORKING DRAWINGS
8. PROJECTION
9. SECTIONING & AUXILIARY VIEWS
10. THREADS
11. ASSEMBLY DRAWINGS
12. ELEC. - PIPING - WELDING DRAWINGS
13. ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS
14. RELATED MATTERS

Unit Plan: Fundamental Figures and Letters

Dover, New Hampshire

UNIT/SUBJECT: Fund/Figures and Letters LP#2B-7

OBJ.(S): Introduce effective use of signs and symbols

ACTIVITY (WHAT):

To draw signs and symbols which will demonstrate the student's ability and understanding in the use of the accepted means of identification.

COND. (HOW):

Using the hand out sheet and layout sheets issued. Indicate the symbols called for.

QUAL. LEVEL (HOW WELL):

Each sign or symbol must be made accurately, and clearly shown. At least 80% must be correct for passing grade.

[ ]	TEXT REF.	[ ]	QUIZ
[ ]	TRANSPARENCY	[ ]	WALL CHART
[X]	WORKSHEET 2B-7	[ ]	REF FOLDER
[X]	HAND OUT SHEET #	[X]	ANS. SHEET 2B-7
[ ]	HOME ASSIGN.	[ ]	

Program Plan Format

Butte, Montana

PROGRAM PLAN

PD 1.0

School _____

Class or Classes _____

Administrator _____

Evaluator _____

Planning Team Members _____

_____

I. Summary of Program Plan

II. Goal of the Program

III. Justification of the Program

IV. Administrative Characteristics of the Program

Pupils Served

number _____

reason for inclusion (age, grade, interest, need, other)

Resources Needed for Program

space (indicate number of classrooms needed and any special features; other facilities)

staff (indicate number of teachers, aides, volunteers, others; and any special characteristics)

equipment

materials

Time (duration of program in weeks, amount of time per week)

Budget (total dollar amount)

V. Description of the Instructional or Action Component

Program Objective (list, numbering each)

V. Description of the Action Component (continued)

Program Objective Number	Measurable Objectives or Intended Outcomes	Activities (Indicate what the program staff do, what the program subjects do, materials and setting)

V. Description of the Action Component (continued)

Schedule (list objectives or activities and mark start and completion times with *)

# of Obj. or activity	**									

** Enter months by name or number e.g. Jan. or 1 etc.

VI. Description of the Evaluation Component

Purpose of the Evaluation (list the questions which the evaluation will answer)

Instruments (describe the tests, records, reports, documents or other instruments for collecting information; and how they will be used)

VI. Description of the Evaluation Component (continued)

Schedule (fill in tasks under major heading and mark appropriate time line)

Enter month Enter start/finish on chart												
Collection of Information												
Analysis of Information												
Dissemination of Information												

VII. Description of the Management Component

Enter Month and mark start and finish of each activity.

Tasks for both Action and Evaluation													responsible individual (optional)	estimated cost (optional)

Total ~~105~~

Program Plan: Secondary School Curriculum

University of Washington

Howard Johnson, Professor

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
College of Education

Education C&I 558 (3 credits)
Secondary School Curriculum

Howard M. Johnson
Winter, 1973

COURSE OUTLINE

I. Course Description

The course includes a systematic description and analysis of current curriculum practices with particular emphasis upon the factors and forces affecting secondary school curriculum. Special attention will be given to recent innovation and change in secondary curriculum and students will be expected to develop a clear statement regarding the role of the secondary school in American society.

II. Course Objectives

Through required and optional reading, case study analysis, class discussions written assignments, and descriptions as provided by various guest speakers the student is expected:

1. To develop an increased awareness of the origin and growth of secondary schools in our society.
2. To show an increased awareness of the multiple factors affecting the content and scope of the secondary school curriculum.
3. To gain an increased understanding of the various types of curricular objectives and the way in which these objectives can be used in curriculum planning.
4. To demonstrate an understanding of the many variables affecting the school scheduling process.
5. To demonstrate an ability to analyze curricular issues in a logical and systematic manner.
6. To gain an increased familiarity with curricular programs operating in secondary schools.
7. To become increasingly committed to improving the curriculum of our secondary schools and to acquire certain skills to help accomplish that goal.

III. Course Assignments and Evaluation

Each student will be expected to participate actively in class discussion and will be responsible for reading materials as included in the course outline. Other readings will be suggested as the course progresses and selected materials will be distributed in class. In addition to general class participation which will account for approximately 20 percent of the overall evaluation, the student evaluation will be based upon the following:

1. Written critique of two case studies: (10 percent)
   a) "English at Central Western"
   b) "Curriculum Change at Laguna" or "A School in Transition"
2. Schedule of Washington High School (15 percent)
3. Assessment of Recent Proposal for Program Change (25 percent)
4. Final examination (30 percent)

Details and deadlines for each of these written assignments will be discussed in class. Case studies will be distributed well in advance of deadlines.

The class will be divided into smaller groups for most of the case discussion sessions. A school visitation may be planned as part of the regular class schedule and students will be encouraged to visit schools as such visits relate to their own interests.

Any student having an interest in examining some particular topic related to secondary school curriculum can negotiate with the instructor to substitute a paper on this topic for the "Assessment of Recent Proposal for Program Change" assignment. Because this is a general course on curriculum rather than a methods course for a particular subject area, any substitute assignment or project must deal in some way with the general function and/or purpose of secondary education rather than developments in a specific subject area. Because of the instructor's basic sympathy with individualized contract learning, students with definite ideas are encouraged to utilize this optional assignment. Make sure to negotiate this option during the first few weeks of the course.

IV. Topical Outline and Suggested Readings

Section 1: Patterns of Curricular Organization

Topics for Class Consideration

1. Sources of Authority in Curriculum Development
2. American Value System and Education
3. Organizational Patterns and Curriculum Planning
4. Goals of Secondary Education
5. The Middle School in American Education
6. Case Study on "Community Resistance to School Reorganization"

Suggested References:

Alford, Robert R., "School District Reorganization and Community Integration," *Harvard Educational Review*, Fall, 1960, pp. 350-371.

Hahn, Robert O. and Bidna, David B., *Secondary Education*, Second Edition, 1970, pp. 85-103, 162-167, 194-197, and 210-217. (Reserve)

Katz, Michael B., *Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools*, (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971), pp. 105-146. (Reserve)

Kealy, Ronald, "The Middle School Movement, 1960-1970," *National Elementary School Principal*, November, 1971, pp. 20-25.

Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1971, pp. 100-104.

Tanner, Daniel, *Secondary Education*, 1972, pp. 316-338. (Reserve)

Section 2: Elements of Curriculum Design

Topics for Class Consideration

1. Specification of Objectives
2. Continuous Progress and Individualization
3. Minimum Competency Curriculum
4. School Accreditation Requirements and Procedures
5. Case Study on "English at Central Western"

Suggested References:

Bellack, Arno A. "What Knowledge is of Most Worth," *High School Journal*, February, 1965, pp. 318-332.

Bockman, John F. and Valerie M. Bockman, "Contracting for Learning Outcomes: Potentialities and Limitations," *NASSP Bulletin*, February, 1973, pp. 17-26.

Bloom, Benjamin S. (ed.), *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Cognitive Domain*, McKay Company, 1656, pp. 1-24 and 201-207. (Reserve)

Bruner, Jerome S., *The Process of Education*, Harvard University Press, 1960, pp. 17-32. (For those using other editions of publications of Bruner's book, this is Chapter 2 on "The Importance of Structure.") (Reserve)

Hahn, Robert O. and Bidna, David B., *Secondary Education*, Second Edition, 1970, pp. 179-183. (Reserve)

Hull, Ronald E., "Selecting an Approach to Individualized Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, November, 1973, pp. 169-173.

Krathwohl, David R., Bloom, Benjamin S., and Masia, Bertram B., *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Affective Domain*, McKay Company, 1964, pp. 1-23 and 176-185. (Reserve -- listed under Bloom in card catalogues)

Mager, Robert F., *Preparing Instructional Objectives*, Fearon Publishers, 1972. (Reserve)

Section 3: Schedule, A Means of Implementing Curriculum

Topics for Class Consideration

1. Factors Involved in Scheduling
2. Computer Assistance in Schedule Building
3. Types of School Schedules
4. Building the Master Schedule
5. Unscheduled Time and Student Option

Suggested References:

Austin, David B. and Gividen, Noble, *The High School Principal and Staff Develop the Master Schedule*, Secondary School Administration Series, Columbia University, 1960, pp. 48-76. (Reserve)

Hahn, Robert O. and Bidna, David B., *Secondary Education*, 1970, pp. 225-228. (Reserve)

Johnson, Howard M., "Flexibility in the Secondary School," *NASSP Bulletin*, October, 1969, pp. 62-72.

Richardson, Don H., "Independent Study: What Difference Does It Make?" *NASSP Bulletin*, September, 1967, pp. 53-62.

Trump, J. Lloyd and Delmas F. Miller, *Secondary School Curriculum Improvement*, 1968, pp. 307-325. (Reserve)

Section 4: Student Rights and Responsibilities

Topics for Class Consideration

1. Legal Basis for Student Rights Movement
2. School Attendance Accounting Procedures
3. School Disciplinary Procedures
4. Counseling and the Discipline Function
5. Student Attitudes and the Alternative School

Suggested References:

Arons, Stephen, "Compulsory Education," *Saturday Review*, January 15, 1972, pp. 52-57.

Goodman, Paul, *Compulsory Mis-education*, New York Horizon Press, 1964, pp. 63-97. (For those using other editions or publications of Goodman's book, this is Chapters 4 and 5.) (Reserve)

Havighurst, Robert J., "American Youth in the Mid-Seventies," *NASSP Bulletin*, November, 1972, pp. 1-13.

Johnson, Howard M., "Are Compulsory Attendance Laws Outdated," *Phi Delta Kappan*, December, 1973, pp. 226-232.

Kozol, Jonathan, "Free Schools, A Time for Candor," *Saturday Review*, March 4, 1972, pp. 51-54.

Skinner, B. F., "The Free and Happy Student," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Spetember, 1973, pp. 13-16.

Swift, Larry E. (ed.), "Student Rights and Responsibilities: A Manual for the Development of School District Rules and Policies Governing the Conduct of Students," Northwest District Administrators Association, May, 1972, pp. 4-9 and 44-57. (Reserve)

Triezenberg, George, "Student Communication Rights," *NASSP Bulletin*, April, 1973, pp. 13-23.

Wilhelms, Fred T., "Multiple Ways to a More Humane School," *NASSP Bulletin*, February, 1972, pp. 1-8.

Section 5: Teacher Role in Changing Curriculum

Topics for Class Consideration

1. Differentiation in the Teaching Function
2. Case Studies on "Curriculum Change at Laguna" and "A School in Transition"
3. Influence of Media Development on Teacher Role
4. Performance Based Teacher Training
5. Performance Contracting and the Accountability Movement
6. Education with a Clearly Stated Purpose

Suggested References:

Bailey, Stephen K., "Teacher's Centers: A British First," *Phi Delta Kappan*, November, 1971, pp. 146-149.

Dash, Edward F., "Contract for Grades," *Clearing House*, December, 1970, pp. 231-23

Hahn, Robert O. and Bidna, David B., *Secondary Education*, 1970, pp. 296-301. (Reserve)

Halsey, C. Van Rensselaer, "Comments on New Transcript Patterns," *NASSP Bulletin* September, 1972, pp. 118-131.

Hapgood, Marilyn, "The Open Classroom: Protect It from Its Friends," *Saturday Review*, September 18, 1971, pp. 66-75.

Howe, Harold II, "Remarks Regarding Career Education," *NASSP Bulletin*, March, 1973, pp. 40-51.

Page, Ellis, "How We All Failed at Performance Contracting," *Phi Delta Kappan*, October, 1972, pp. 115-117.

Saretsky, Gary, "The Strangely Significant Case of Peter Doe," *Phi Delta Kappan*, May, 1973, pp. 589-592.

Woodington, Donald D., "Accountability from the Viewpoint of a State Commission of Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, October, 1972, pp. 95-97.

V. Office Hours

Students are encouraged to seek out assistance from the instructor at any time. Official office hours will be Thursday afternoons from 2:30 until 4:30 p.m. unless announced otherwise by the instructor. The office is in Lewis Hall Annex, Room 144. Feel free to drop in at any time; however, due to the instructor's responsibilities with the Bureau of School Service and Research, it might be a good idea to call ahead to make sure he is available (543-4940). Don't hesitate to ask for assistance. Your request will be welcomed at any time.

SPECS: School Planning, Evaluation, and Communication System

2.3: General and performance objectives for an instructional program

Program Title Secondary School Curriculum Program Code

School Year 1973-74 Semester Winter Program Date(s) January 7 - March 22

Program Planner(s) Johnson, H.

Program Implementer(s) Johnson, H.

GENERAL AND PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM

List below the general or nonmeasurable objectives for which actual student performance data will be collected during the program; code these 1, 2, 3, etc. Then, to the extent possible, translate each general objective into the one or more performance objectives that define mastery of it in observable and measurable terms; code these 1, 2, 3. . . in relation to their general objectives, e.g., 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, etc. (It is not mandatory that all general objectives be translated into performance objectives.)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM (nonmeasurable)	RELATED PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES (For each general objective, what behavior is to be exhibited, under what evaluative conditions, and at what level of proficiency to demonstrate mastery?)
1. To develop an increased awareness of the origin and growth of secondary schools in our society.	1.1 To demonstrate an awareness of the origin of secondary schools in American society by responding correctly to two out of three related multiple choice questions on an examination. 1.2 To describe the growth patterns in our secondary schools and the pressures for curricular change associated with these patterns. Mastery will be shown by responding correctly to two out of three examination questions.
2. To show an increased awareness of the multiple factors affecting the content and scope of the secondary school curriculum.	2.1 To identify at least three major sources or factors which influence the secondary curriculum in today's schools and to describe the nature of this influence in precise terms. The instructor's judgment of student class discussion will be used to determine mastery. 2.2 To describe a process of obtaining broad participation in the determination of the scope of the curriculum in a secondary school. The student will verbally explain such a system to the satisfaction of the instructor. 2.3 To describe the origin of recent student rights emphasis and to assess its impact in the secondary school. Mastery will be shown by responding correctly to two out of three examination questions.
3. To gain an increased understanding of various types of curricular objectives and the way in which these objectives can be used in curriculum planning.	3.1 To distinguish between institutional, process, and product objectives by correctly identifying at least five out of six samples presented as part of an examination. 3.2 To understand the varying specificity in the statement of curricular objectives and to be able to identify the appropriate level of specificity in selected situations. Mastery will be based on instructor judgment of a single question from the quiz on objectives. 3.3 To identify evaluation techniques appropriate to the measurement of curricular objectives. Mastery is appropriate identifications on two out of three as presented on a quiz.

General and Performance Objectives of the Program (continued).

GENERAL OBJECTIVES	RELATED PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES
4. To demonstrate an understanding of the many variables affecting the school scheduling process.	4.1 To understand the important relationship between curricular methods and the scheduling of resources. The student will correctly identify two scheduling factors or considerations associated with a particular curricular method. 4.2 To identify at least three different types of scheduling and to describe the appropriate situational environment for each. On an interim quiz, each student will adequately describe at least three distinct schedule types and identify curricular activities supported by two of these. 4.3 To schedule a sample school in a manner which gives needed attention to staff capabilities, student requests, class size limitations and room availability.
5. To demonstrate an ability to analyze curricular issues in a logical and systematic manner.	5.1 To examine a complex curricular problem as described in a case study and to identify a set of major concerns. Mastery is based on instructor assessment of student response in case discussion sessions, and the student's written cases. 5.2 To present a logical and systematic written response to a complex curricular problem of the type presented in a written case study. Such response should not only represent a reasoned treatment of the problem but should be written in an organized and clear manner. Instructor judgment will be used to assess mastery level. 5.3 To demonstrate familiarity with a wide variety of curricular patterns (team teaching, learning packets, computer based instruction, etc.) used in the secondary schools and to describe the advantages and limitations of each. Mastery is according to the instructor's assessment of satisfactory student evaluation of at least two of three curricular innovations as presented on an examination.
Objectives which are considered important in the course but for which no measurement will be conducted. These objectives are judged to be difficult to measure in an objective manner.	
6. To gain an increased familiarity with curricular programs operating in secondary schools.	
7. To become increasingly committed to improving the curriculum of our secondary schools and to acquire certain skills to help accomplish that goal.	

© 1973 STATE OF OREGON, ACTING BY AND THROUGH THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION ON BEHALF OF THE CENTER FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN CANADA. PUBLISHED BY GENERAL LEARNING CORPORATION.

SPECS: School Planning, Evaluation, and Communication System

4.0: Planning and evaluating one general objective in an instructional unit or program

Code Number of the General Objective to be Planned and Evaluated 4.0

(This document for planning detailed instruction relevant to one general objective could be preceded by Document 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 or 2.4, for each lists all of the general objectives in the total unit or program. If a restatement of the general objective is desired here, do so:

To demonstrate an understanding of the many variables affecting the school scheduling process.

Otherwise, simply use the objective's code number as it appears on Document 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, or 2.4).

A. Related Performance Objectives. List below the one or more performance objectives that define mastery of this particular general objective in observable and measurable terms; code these 1, 2, 3, etc. and relate them to the code number of this document's general objective, e.g., 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, etc. or 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, etc. Within each performance objective indicate what behavior is to be exhibited, under what evaluative conditions, and at what level of proficiency to demonstrate mastery of the general objective.

4.1 To understand the important relationship between curricular methods and the scheduling of curricular resources. (On a final examination (post-test), each student will identify at least two scheduling factors associated with a particular curricular method and will describe the way in which each factor affects implementation of the curricular method in question.)

4.2 To identify at least three different types of scheduling and to describe the appropriate situational environment for each. (On an interim quiz, each student will be able to describe the characteristics of at least three distinct schedule types and to identify the kinds of curricular organization and/or activities supported by at least two of these basic schedule types.)

4.3 To schedule a sample school in a manner which gives needed attention to staff capabilities, student requests, class size limitations, and room availability. (On a pre-test, each student will be asked to outline his or her prior experience with scheduling. Those with limited experience will be assigned a simulation problem and will be expected to schedule the simulated school in a manner consistent with this objective.)

B. Evaluation. List below the specific evaluative techniques that will be used before, during, and/or after instruction to determine students' mastery of the objectives.

Pre-Instruction Evaluation:

A pre-test will be used to assess the extent of experience with schedule building activities. (Objective # 4.3)

During Instruction Evaluation:

Completion of the schedule simulation problem as related to Objective # 4.3 and a special quiz check attainment of Objective # 4.2.

Post-Instruction Evaluation:

At least one question on the final examination will relate to Objective # 4.1.

C. Planned Instructional Processes. For each performance objective, describe below what the students and the teacher will do during instruction to help students achieve that objective. Use the code numbers given above to relate these statements of process to specific performance objectives.

Objective # 4.1 -- Discuss with the total class the advantages and disadvantages of various schedule types (modular, rotating, etc.) and relate these to certain curricular forms (competency based, learning packages, group paced, team teaching, etc.)

Objective # 4.2 -- Distribute handout showing several schedule models and assign students to review selected models at the following class meeting.

Objective # 4.3 -- Assign each student to complete a simulated schedule problem and respond to questions after the assignment is turned into the instructor.

Indicate also what students will do if they demonstrate mastery of the objectives before formal instruction begins or if they do so before all students have completed the instructional procedures.

Those students who have had substantial experience with the scheduling process will be asked to review a study of schedule impact on staff loads conducted in 1972-73 by the Bureau of School Service and Research and will be expected to develop a meaningful project related to that study. Very few students will have had sufficient experience to justify this particular option.

D. Actual Performance Measures. For each measurable objective, indicate below the total number of students who (a) were exposed to the objective; (b) demonstrated mastery before formal instruction: MB; (c) demonstrated mastery after formal instruction: MA; (d) made considerable, some, or little or no progress toward mastery; CP, SP, LP respectively; or (e) were not exposed to the objective or adequately measured: U. (If individual data are being kept in one of these forms of the SPECS *Record of Student Performance*, this summary may not be necessary).

General Objective Code 4.0

P.O.	Total Number of Students	MB	MA	CP	SP	LP	U
4.1	20	0	13	0	0	0	7
4.2	20	0	16	0	0	0	4
4.3	20	0	13	4	3	0	0

E. Analysis and Suggestions. Finally, indicate below which instructional processes proved to be particularly effective, which did not, and why. Indicate as well the specific changes you would advise when planning another cycle of instruction directed toward this general objective.

The simulated schedule problem was particularly effective as a learning device. Insufficient time was spent on objective # 4.2 and the students who explained it in class were not well prepared. The large number of students for whom mastery was undetermined (objectives # 4.1 and # 4.2) was due to lack of time. The interim quiz as originally planned was not given so mastery on these latter objectives was based on instructor judgment of class discussions.

1973 STATE OF OREGON, ACTING BY AND THROUGH THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION ON BEHALF OF THE CENTER FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN CANADA. PUBLISHED BY GENERAL LEARNING CORPORATION.

SPECS: School Planning, Evaluation, and Communication System

5.2: Weekly lesson plan for one program

Dates ~~of instruction~~ To Be Planned January 10, 17, 24, 31, February 7

Program/Unit Title Secondary School Curriculum

Time Period

Objectives to be Addressed During the Week. (Either state in full or refer by code numbers to the objectives stated in accompanying documents 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, or 2.4) 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3

	PLANNED INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESSES	PLANNED EVALUATIVE PROCESSES	REQUIRED RESOURCES
MONDAY	Period: 1 Objectives: 1.1, 1.2, 2.1 1. Distribute and review course outlines. 2. Introduction by students / inventory of interest 3. Pre-test on critical performance objectives. 4. Distribute case study on "School Reorganization" 5. Historical perspective a) Enrollment trends (handout) b) Key developments 6. Referent group [students, society, and subjects] approach to curriculum (examples)	Pre-test on Objectives # 1.1, 1.2, 2.3, 3.1, 4.3, 5.3 Test will have three items related to Objectives # 1.1, 1.2, 2.3, and 5.3, six items related to Objective # 3.1, and a single item related to Objective # 4.3.	
TUESDAY	Period: 2 Objectives: 2.1, 2.2 1. Discuss case study on "School Reorganization" 2. Contrast referent and functional component approaches to curriculum -- PDK process. 3. Review processes of approval and accreditation -- state and Northwest. 4. Distribute schedule problem and assign students to review schedule handout to be used in next class meeting.	Observe the extent of student involvement in case discussion and specifically look for ability to identify issues (Objective # 5.1)	
WEDNESDAY	Period: 3 Objectives: 4.2, 6 1. Guest speaker on need for alternative educational formats (Lois Benson from Lincoln High's Choice not Chance Program) 2. Reports by students on alternative school schedule models. 3. Outline factors to be considered in completing schedule problem	Review work on gaining broad participation on curriculum scope and evaluate selected students according to their ability to describe a reasonable system for a single school. (Objective # 2.2)	

PLANNED INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESSES		PLANNED EVALUATIVE PROCESSES	REQUIRED RESOURCES
PLAN — January 31	Period: 4 Objectives: 4.1, 3.1 1. Explain difference between schedule building and assignment phases of scheduling process. 2. Discuss with class the advantages and disadvantages of schedule types (modular, rotating, etc.) and the curricular implications of each. (Handout) 3. Present definition of objective types and review examples with class. 4. Answer questions on schedule problem.	A short quiz on the types of scheduling used in secondary schools. Mastery will be the successful description of three different schedule types. (Objective #4.2)	
PLAN — February 7	Period: 5 Objectives: 3.2, 4.3 1. Review a sequence of objectives from very general to very specific and discuss appropriate uses of various levels. 2. Collect schedule problem assignments and discuss optional problem section. 3. Guest speaker on "Learning Package Development" (John Borrow, Juanita High)	Give a practice quiz on identifying types of objectives (product, process, institutional) and expect all students to properly identify at least five out of six. Also included will be questions on specificity and evaluation of product objectives (Objectives #3.1, 3.2, and 3.3)	
ANALYSIS	Processes used during the ~~week~~ time period that proved to be particularly effective.	Processes used during the ~~week~~ time period that proved to be particularly ineffective.	

©1973 STATE OF OREGON, ACTING BY AND THROUGH THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION ON BEHALF OF THE CENTER FO THE ADVANCED STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. PRINTED IN TH

SPECS: School Planning, Evaluation, and Communication System

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Program Title: Secondary School Curriculum (EDC&I 558) Program Code:

Program Location: University of Washington Program Dates: 1/3/74 - 3/21/74

Personnel Responsible for Planning, Implementing, and Evaluating the Program:

Howard M. Johnson

A. Critical General Objectives of the Program. List below the program's most critical general or nonmeasurable objectives. Code these 1, 2, 3, etc.; or cross-reference them by specific code number to the particular SPECS Planning and Evaluation Documents that detail their treatment.

1. To develop an increased awareness of the origin and growth of secondary schools in our society.
2. To show an increased awareness of the multiple factors affecting the content and scope of the secondary school curriculum.
3. To gain an increased understanding of various types of curricular objectives and the way in which these objectives can be used in curriculum planning.
4. To demonstrate an understanding of the many variables affecting the school scheduling process.
5. To demonstrate an ability to analyze curricular issues in a logical and systematic manner.
6. To gain an increased familiarity with curricular programs operating in secondary schools.

B. Critical Performance Objectives of the Program. List below no more than ten of the program's most critical performance objectives. Code these 1, 2, 3, etc. and relate them to the program's critical general objectives, e.g., 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1 etc.; or cross-reference them by specific code number to the particular SPECS Planning and Evaluation Documents that detail their treatment.

Program Code _____

Code Number	What is the behavior to be exhibited?	Under what evaluative conditions?	And at what level of proficiency?
1.2	To describe growth patterns in our secondary schools and the pressures for curricular change associated with these patterns.	Written test	2/3
2.3	To describe the origin of the recent student rights emphasis and to assess its impact in the secondary school.	Written test	2/3
3.1	To distinguish between institutional, process, and product objectives.	Written test	5/6
4.2	To schedule a sample school in a manner which gives needed attention to staff capabilities, student requests, etc.	Sample School Problem Set	12/15
5.3	To demonstrate familiarity with a wide variety of curricular patterns and describe advantages and limitations for each.	Written test	2/3

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Planned Instructional and Evaluative Processes. Describe below the specific processes or procedures that will be employed to achieve each of the program's critical objectives. To the extent possible, use code numbers to relate specific processes to particular objectives. Describe as well the specific techniques that will be used before, during, and/or after the program to assess the extent to which its critical objectives have been achieved. The information presented here should be sufficiently detailed (1) that another professional educator could predict the likelihood of the program's success and (2) that the request for resources on the reverse side requires no further explanation.

Since most objectives call for an increase in knowledge or skill as a result of taking the class, a pre-test (directed to objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.3, 3.1, 4.3, and 5.3) will be given during the first class session. Major class activities and the objectives to which they relate are as follows:

1) Case Study Discussion on "School Reorganization" (objectives 1, 5)

2) Written Case / Discussion on "School in Transition" or "English at Central Western" (objectives 2, 5)

3) Student Reports contrasting several educational writers -- James Corsart / Mortimer Smith, Ivan Illich / Michael Katz, Christopher Jencks / Charles Silberman, Sidney Marland / Harold Howe (objectives 1, 2)

4) Student Reports on student rights and scheduling options (objectives 2.3, 4.1, 4.2)

5) Schedule Simulation to be completed by all students (objective 4.3)

6) Workshoot and brief presentation on writing objectives (objective 3)

7) Guest speakers -- alternative schooling / curriculum coordination in the language arts (objective 6)

8) Student Written Position Papers (objective 5)

The final examination was used to assess actual growth in those objective areas which were covered in the pre-test.

D. Required Resources. List below the specific personnel, materials, facilities, time, etc. that will be required to implement the program's planned processes. (Actual dollar cost estimates may have to be provided by central office staff.)

Regular personnel (Who and for approximately how much time?) ..... $ 680.

Johnson - instructor (80 hrs.)
Vilches - secretary (30 hrs.)

Special personnel (Who and for approximately how much time?) ..... $ -

Barchek - language arts coordinator (3 hrs.)
Benson - choice not chance director (3 hrs.)

Materials and supplies ..... $ 30.

Duplicating and Copy Machine

Equipment ..... $ 10.

Overhead and Carousel Projectors (rental)

Other resources required ..... $

None

TOTAL BUDGETED COSTS $ 720.

E. Group Outcomes on the Program's Critical Performance Objectives. Summarize below the outcomes for all students on the program's most critical performance objectives. "Mastery" is defined by each performance objective; degrees of "progress toward mastery" are defined by the instructor and may vary from objective to objective.

TOTAL This is the total number of students who worked on the objective	ACHIEVEMENT OF MASTERY This is the number of students who achieved mastery on the objective. . . .		PROGRESS TOWARD MASTERY This is the number of students who failed to achieve mastery on the objective during instruction. . .			UNDETERMINED This is the number of students for whom mastery is undetermined
	before instruction	after instruction	but made considerable progress toward it	but made some progress toward it	and made little or no progress toward it	
20	0	15	0	4	1	0
20	5	15	0	0	0	0
20	10	9	0	0	1	0
20	0	13	4	3	0	0
20	2	15	1	2	0	0

F. Analysis and Suggestions. Indicate below which processes or procedures employed in the program proved to be particularly effective, which did not, and why. Indicate as well the specific changes you would advise when planning another cycle of the program. To the extent possible, key these comments to specific program objectives.

Most effective -- student reports on comparing various educational leaders and their views on school goals (particularly useful in connection with objectives #1 and #2)

sample schedule problem (objective #4)

guest speaker on language arts (objectives #2 and #6)

Least effective -- objective worksheets (didn't have time to review them)

overview of schedule types (not enough discussion and explanation to some students)

reference materials were not related specifically to course topics of discussion and presentation

Suggestions for next cycle --

schedule special help session (for some students) on objectives and don't take so much class time.

make certain student presentors on schedule types are better prepared to discuss various options in class.

Summary of Program Costs

	Budgeted Amount	Expended Amount	Difference
Personnel Services	$ 680.	$ 680.	$ 0.
Contracted Services	—	—	
Materials and Supplies	30.	45.	+15.
Equipment (rental)	10.	12.	+2.
Other			
TOTAL COST	$ 720.	$ 737.	$ +17.

1973 STATE OF OREGON, ACTING BY AND THROUGH THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION ON BEHALF OF THE CENTER FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. PRINTED IN THE

WHAT DO I NEED TO KNOW BESIDES SPECS?

The role of the educational consultant is sometimes an awkward one. Problems often arise as a result of misperceptions about duties, payment for services, or support assistance. To alleviate as many of these problems as necessary, it may be useful for the consultant to keep in mind the following questions and statements.

1. Does the organization really need SPECS? Or would the organization's needs best be met in other ways? For example, if the problems within the district are mainly those of communication between the administration and teachers, then the introduction of SPECS may be inappropriate at this time. Rather, emphasis on communication skills or organization development may be most useful.
2. Does the organization have key personnel who can implement the system, thus eliminating the need for an external consultant? If so, what will be the role of that internal person and how will the two work together? Establishing some ground rules regarding working relationships may eliminate friction at a later date.

If a school district has a curriculum director who has been trained in the writing of instructional objectives, district officials may wish to use that person to train others in the implementation of Component Three. In that case, the consultant should ascertain the terminology being used, the extensiveness of the training and related matters. Otherwise, the consultant's services may overlap or they may not cover the necessary material for a successful implementation. The result may be unpleasant and unproductive for all of those involved.

3. When will the SPECS consultant no longer be needed by the organization? The consultant's task in the organization may be complete when one or all of the following have occurred:

(a) All five components of the system have been implemented to the satisfaction of the key personnel within the district. In other words, a program budgeting and cost accounting system has been developed, an instructional planning and evaluation model is fully operational, the community defined educational goals are established and the policy making body of the organization has assessed the gaps and matches in the system.

(b) The organization is no longer interesting in implementing SPECS. Unless the district wishes to have the consultant assist them in non-SPECS related activities, there is obviously little need for a consultant once the site has chosen to discontinue implementation. In such a case, the consultant should attempt to determine the reason for the lack of interest, and bid district officials adieu while keeping the door open to future possibilities of assisting them.

(c) District personnel are able to provide needed assistance to other internal personnel. Some districts will have staff personnel who are thoroughly familiar with changing to a program budgeting system or with writing instructional objectives; therefore, the district may not need this kind of assistance. Rather, they may need assistance to develop a Master Plan. Occasionally, a consultant can train a district leader who can then replace the consultant. However, many districts prefer to use the consultant as the "expert from afar."

(d) Target dates and objectives agreed upon in the Master Plan have been met. The Master Plan will define when the tasks, including those which are the consultant's responsibility, will be completed. As those near completion, it may be well for the consultant to reassess the needs of the district and discuss with district leaders additional ways in which he/she can be of service to them.

(e) The consultant's ideas are no longer valued by district personnel. For various reasons, ranging from personality and cultural differences to communication problems, the consultant's ideas may not be valued by district personnel. In such a case, it makes little sense to continue to work with people (regarding SPECS or any other topic) who are unwilling to listen or to cooperate. The consultant's time can be better spent by finding district personnel who are interested in SPECS.

4. Are the reporting procedures for the SPECS consultant firmly established? Are they clear and acceptable to all parties? In other words, if the consultant is displeased about an occurrence related to implementing SPECS, who is the appropriate person to tell? If the teachers or others working with the consultant are displeased, to whom would they take their grievance? In some instances, an informal agreement is sufficient, whereas in other instances, a more detailed and written agreement may be necessary.

5. Have time-lines been established? Often the organization is hazy about what it wants to occur and, therefore, it is sometimes difficult

to encourage its leaders to set definite time-lines and attach them to a task. However, once agreement has been reached about the level of involvement by the organization, the next step can be that of specifying tasks to be completed. Attaching a date and person(s) responsible should automatically follow.

6. Is financial support sufficient to complete the task? Prior to accepting the responsibility for serving as a SPECS consultant, attempt to determine the requirements of the task, the amount of time, and of course, how valuable the time is in this particular market. The amount of money that districts have available for consultancy, the amount they are willing to spend and the amount needed to complete the task may be three differing amounts.

The effective SPECS consultant will probably soon learn that s/he needs to be aware of and have knowledge of the problems which the district may encounter in implementing SPECS. Furthermore, the consultant will realize that, in addition to needs which may be fulfilled by implementing SPECS, the organization may have other needs that can not be met by SPECS. Perhaps the organization could best be served by a training sequence in organizational development or a workshop in time management or management by objectives. Without some knowledge of other "solutions," the consultant can not provide as much assistance as necessary. Knowledge and experience with Organizational Development, Management by Objectives, Goal and Objectives Writing may be most helpful in working with an organization interested in SPECS.

OTHER SPECS CONSULTANTS HAVE SAID

During the field test, consultants worked closely with the various sites as they attempted to implement SPECS. Most worked with the board, the administrators, and the instructors. Each of the consultants had prior experience in working as a consultant and in working with systems such as MBO and PERT. Some had experience with OD.

At the end of the field test, the consultants met with the SPECS Development Team for the purpose of sharing experiences about their SPECS consultation, and to make some generalizations about those experiences. A list of nearly 200 statements was generated as a result of that meeting. Those statements were categorized into the following areas: implementation, orientation, environment, costs, and benefits, decision making and conflict, consultant role, administrator role, instructor role, and materials. During the final SPECS Field Test Conference, participants who had been implementing the system studied those generalizations, added some of their own, and voted as to their agreement or disagreement about them. Those generalizations and statements regarding each of them are included in this manual as additional information which might assist the consultant.

Implementation: What characteristics of an educational organization indicate high potential for successful implementation of SPECS?

Nearly three-fourths of the participants indicated that reliance on outside money makes it more difficult to make SPECS an integral part of district operations. In some instances, it seemed that the district leaders were interested in receiving outside money to enable them to retain personnel who would otherwise be dismissed due to budget cutbacks.

In other instances, it seemed that theirs was interest in and support for SPECS only as long as outside money was available. Generally, it seemed that participants were saying that if the district was willing to support SPECS without outside money, there would probably be greater and longer commitment to it.

All conference participants said that they found it was easier to implement SPECS when SPECS-like activities had already occurred in the organization. Several of the field test sites had been involved in either program budgeting activities or community goal definition prior to hearing about SPECS. Personnel from other sites had participated in a task analysis workshop or a class which focused on writing performance objectives. Those related experiences seemed to provide confidence for those persons who later engaged in SPECS activities.

Although most of the implementation activity occurred at the elementary level, participants disagreed that Component Three is more easily implemented in elementary schools than in secondary schools, or community colleges. Repeatedly throughout the field test, the Development Team encountered greater resistance from secondary teachers toward implementation; however, most of the literature would support the statement that most innovative activities are more readily accepted at the elementary level.

The consultants said little about the potential for successful implementation of Component Three increasing as the consultative role in the curriculum development of the teacher increases; however, most participants indicated that they strongly supported such a statement. Furthermore, they indicated that the implementing organization must support voluntary approaches to implementation rather than authoritarian dictates. Repeatedly,

throughout the field test, the Development Team saw examples of leaders who took an authoritarian approach in their attempts to implement SPECS. Generally, it seemed that those attempts were not as widely accepted by teachers as were the voluntary approaches to implementation. In some cases, however, waiting for participants to volunteer produced little result.

Participants were firmly in agreement that one person should be given the responsibility for overseeing the implementation effort. Although several persons may comprise a Task Force or different persons may be responsible for implementing each of the components, the major responsibility for implementation needs to remain with one person and that person needs to be visible to all.

Orientation: What are the factors that contribute most to a successful orientation?

All participants were in complete agreement that the innovation must appear to be rational and logical. No data was gathered to indicate how participants or their fellow implementors might determine if an innovation, in this case, SPECS, might be rational and logical.

Again, participants indicated strong support for the statement that "persons inside and outside the organization who are responsible for introducing and implementing SPECS must have prior credibility with potential users." Prior credibility could have resulted from the person being responsible having recently been in a colleagial arrangment with other implementors, having specific knowledge of MBO, OD, or subject matter, charisma, or other reasons. Perhaps the credibility issue relates to a generalization that

the participants formulated themselves which says that "Orientation is most successful when each component is presented to an appropriate audience on a basis of 'need to know'." In other words, perhaps the person (inside or outside the organization) who was responsible for the introduction and implementation entered the organization in that role at the exact time that the audience "needed to know" about some portion of SPECS. Consultants should keep this in mind when presenting SPECS to an organization, thus alleviating the possibility of discussing SPECS with personnel who have no need for the information derived from SPECS.

Environment: What are the environmental factors that affect the implementation, adoption and diffusion of SPECS?

During recent years, numerous state legislatures throughout the country have passed legislation that encourage, if not mandate, some form of accountability in education. Only two conference participants disagreed with the statement that implementation, adaption, and diffusion will occur more quickly when legislative mandate is apparent. Furthermore, nearly the same number indicated that local political setting acutely affects levels and degrees of implementation.

Throughout the field test, Development Team members had been interested in observing if these districts with experience and with innovations would more readily use SPECS than those with limited experience with innovation. Conference participants readily agreed that these organizations having experience with innovation will more readily use SPECS.

Another environmental factor that often affects implementation, adoption and diffusion is the location within the organization for the

invitation or encouragement of support for the innovation. Two-thirds of the SPECS Conference participants indicated that the support must come from top-level management. Furthermore, the same individuals stated that classroom personnel must be aware of that support. Specifically, that means that there is probably a limited success potential for SPECS in organizations where only classroom instructors or middle management is supportive of SPECS. This doesn't preclude one or several classroom teachers using Component Three to plan and evaluate their own program.

All Conference participants unanimously agreed that organizations that encourage individual teacher creative efforts are more likely to be receptive to SPECS.

Again, all participants agreed that the initiation of SPECS must come from teachers or at least a cooperative group of teachers and administrators.

Nearly one-half agreed that monetary rewards were more important than released time or additional clerical assistance in encouraging teachers to use SPECS; however, the other half completely disagreed. Regardless of the rewards offered, all agreed that teacher costs from SPECS-usage occur early and rewards are delayed.

Also, all participants agreed that if SPECS activities are seen as a replacement to current work, the likelihood of success is enhanced. And they were in accord that a benefit of SPECS is the improvement of teacher-parent dialogue, and that SPECS enables programs to maintain integrity when teachers turnover occurs. This particular item was one completely written by participants and no attempt was made to determine this definition of integrity. It is assumed that the participants used the term integrity as being synonymous with continuity of programs.

When asked if SPECS required too much record-keeping and thus, assistance by an aide or computer was required, only one-third of the participants agreed.

Perceptions: What are the perceived values and costs for those using the system?

Perceived values and costs may differ substantially from the actual ones; however, the perception held by teachers and administrators as they use SPECS are the ones which undoubtedly affect their future use of the system. Formal research regarding teacher and administrator perceptives has been reported in separate studies; however, what is included here is the response which conference participants provided.

They were about unanimous in their agreement that if SPECS was not perceived by teachers or administrators as extra work, the teachers and administrators were more likely to encourage others to use the system. This certainly seems reasonable, in that few of us are interested in encouraging any activity that may incur additional work.

A division occurred among respondents regarding rewards for encouraging teachers to use SPECS.

CONCLUSION

As you have read through this manual you may have thought of many questions for which you could find no answers. The intention of the editor has been to provide the reader with the basics, yet allowing the consultant to use common sense, good judgment, and other materials to fill any gaps. Little hope exists of ever having any manual which could answer every possible question about implementing a system--particularly one so complex as SPECS; however, it is possible for one to understand the system and potential implementation means by following the steps provided here and in the implementation manuals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bloom, Benjamin S., (ed.) and others. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook I: Cognitive Domain (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956), p. 7.